

SLOVAKIA

VOL. VI

MARCH, 1956

NO. 1 (18)



IN THIS ISSUE:

"MEMOIRS OF DR. EDUARD BENEŠ" — Review

Louis Štúr Centennial

Štúr: Father of Modern Slovak Nationalism

Štúr's Group in the Service of the People

Radio Free Europe (Reprint from "FACTS FORUM")

Kerner's "Czechoslovakia": History or Propaganda?

WHO SAID IT: 16

* * *

Edited and compiled by

PHILIP A. HROBAK

SLOVAKIA

Box 150

Middletown, Pa.

•

Published by

THE SLOVAK LEAGUE OF AMERICA
GANSER LIBRARY
MILLERSVILLE STATE COLLEGE
MILLERSVILLE, PA. 17551

JIRÍ (GEORGE) BRADA

author of the article on RADIO FREE EUROPE, which was published in the "FACTS FORUM" (Dallas, Texas; \$2.00 per annum) and is reprinted in this issue of the "SLOVAKIA," was born of CZECH parents in Brno, Moravia (Czecho-Slovakia), on March 8, 1923. He is a student of psychology and sociology, and is well versed in several languages. During the years of the Nazi occupation, Brada worked in a factory and also managed to do some studying at the English Institute in Brno and the University of Rostock. Unlike many other Czechs of his age, he never joined the Nazi Party, nor any of the organizations which upon the defeat of Nazi Germany, were declared to be fascist either by the Allies, or the postwar government of Czecho-Slovakia.

After the war, Brada studied history, philosophy and law at the University of Brno. When the Czech Reds seized all power in Czecho-Slovakia, in February, 1948, he was expelled from the university by the Czech Communist Action Committee and declared ineligible for study at any other school behind the Iron Curtain. Threatened with arrest, after he refused to become an informer for the Czech Communist government, Brada illegally crossed the Czech-Austrian border, October 2, 1948. Since January, 1949, he has been active in several refugee organizations in Germany. From May till July 1951, he was employed by RADIO FREE EUROPE, as a reference assistant and librarian. At present he is a journalist in Germany.

Brada vigorously opposed socialism and communism. In his testimony for the Committee on Communist Aggression, U. S. House of Representatives (Hon. Charles J. Kersten, chairman), of June 28, 1954, Brada made a number of statements which warrant the attention of thoughtful and alert Americans. For example, Mr. Brada made the serious charge that **"the American Intelligence Service (CIC and CIA) is not interested in investigating anything about the communist system."**

"The American authorities," Brada testified, "take as source of information not the opinions of the anti-communist refugees but the communist radio and press in the East... **they swallow every communist swindle** and show to the East clearly that they also are either unintelligent enough to be misled or are communist-dominated..."

"The center of the communist world conspiracy," said Brada, concluding his sworn testimony for the Kersten Committee, "seems thus to be situated in the West, in all these radio stations, as the VOICE OF AMERICA (and) RADIO FREE EUROPE, the CIA and the CIC, in the western crypto-communist press and radio, in the CRUSADE FOR FREEDOM, and FREE EUROPE, INC."

The revelations of Jirí Brada in the 'FACTS FORUM' are not entirely new to the readers of "SLOVAKIA" and the monthly "SLOVAK NEWSLETTER" which are published by the Slovak League of America. They fully support and substantiate what has been written in the two periodicals about Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America. Again we urge our readers: **ASK YOUR SENATORS AND YOUR REPRESENTATIVES TO DEMAND AN INVESTIGATION OF RADIO FREE EUROPE AND THE VOICE OF AMERICA BY CONGRESS, ESPECIALLY THEIR "CZECHOSLOVAK" DIVISIONS!**

SLOVAKIA

Published quarterly by the Slovak League of America

VOL. VI

MARCH, 1956

NO. 1 (18)

"HE TRUSTED THE RUSSIANS" is the title of the review written (The New York Times Book Review, March 4, 1956) by Mr. Gordon A. Craig, professor of History at Princeton University, about the "MEMOIRS OF DR. EDUARD BENEŠ," which were translated from the Czech by Godfrey Lias (346 pp.) and published by the Houghton Mifflin Company of Boston. The book sells for \$7.50.

According to Mr. Craig, Mr. Beneš and T. G. Masaryk "laid the foundations of free 'Czecho-Slovakia,' but mentions nothing about the socialistic state they promoted from the outset. Gen. Milan R. Štefánik, also one of the founders, is completely forgotten. At Geneva (League of Nations), Beneš was 'an indefatigable worker for the rights of the lesser nations.' Mr. Craig, it seems, knows nothing about the fact that Beneš denied the existence of the Slovak nation, without which Czecho-Slovakia would never have come into existence; and if Mr. Craig really did a little research, he might find it difficult to name the 'lesser nations' for which Beneš fought so indefatigably. For example, what did he do or say about the 'lesser nations' which were gobbled up by the Soviet Union?

Munich, we are told, was forced upon Beneš; there was nothing he could do about it. Ten years later, however, after Czecho-Slovakia had regained her freedom, Beneš once again was forced to see his country conquered by totalitarianism. Mr. Craig does not consider the possibility that the policies of Dr. Beneš himself — who was responsible for

foreign policy in his country — may have in at least some measure contributed to the eventual downfall of Czecho-Slovakia.

The book, it is true, is didactic in tone quite laborious in style, frequently repetitious, but it is not "almost devoid of personal anecdotes or even personal judgments," as Mr. Craig states. In fact, it is a record of almost nothing else but Beneš's personal judgments (Beneš always knew, thought, foresaw, decided, recommended, etc.).

In Mr. Craig's opinion, Dr. Beneš may have been the "chief victim of Munich," but that others were less "chief" victims is, I believe, questionable. He says that "levity, egotism, unscrupulousness and criminal ignorance" are among the mildest of the terms used by Beneš to characterize the policy of the Western powers before Munich, but the same terms may be used, and probably more rightly, to characterize Beneš and his policies. Beneš lambasts the Western Powers who created and financed Czecho-Slovakia (which did not even pay her debt to the United States), but in contrast, as Mr. Craig admits, "is almost completely uncritical of Soviet policy in the same years." Mr. Craig does not attempt to explain this attitude of Dr. Beneš; it seems he is completely unaware of the fact that Beneš, too, promoted materialistic socialism.

The Soviet Union, as soon as Beneš succeeded in getting it into the League of Nations, was, according to Beneš, the only major power that sought consistently to maintain the principle of collective

security and that, until Munich, remained true to its treaty obligations. With Czecho-Slovakia, as well as other countries? And what were these treaty obligations? Mr. Craig preferred not to expand on this subject. Beneš did not criticize Soviet policy before Munich and could only praise it after, because his becoming president again depended on Stalin. Nothing else mattered. Beneš was obsessed with the idea that he had to revenge himself on all who opposed his socialistic policies in the past and tried to embarrass him. With the help of Stalin and, of course, the other members of the victorious United Nations, Beneš got what he wanted. At the expense of the Slovak and Czech nations!

The accounts of Beneš's wartime discussions with Roosevelt, Eden, Stalin and other Soviet diplomats, and statesmen — printed in notes and in the appendices — are, as Craig describes it, "perhaps the meatiest part of this book." And Beneš did rely heavily on the Soviet Union and believed in it, because he was a part of the policy of the Soviet Union, even though most historians and reviewers of books fail to recognize this fact.

Beneš boasted that he knew the Russians and the Soviet Union very well; and, of course, he always knew what he was doing and where he was going; he advised Great Britain, the United States, the Soviet Union, France, etc.; no one knew anything better than Beneš when it came to politics; he was the little man who always had a plan, always the GREAT "democratic" statesman, diplomat, politician, and international lawyer! How else could Czecho-Slovakia end than it did?

After the Munich debacle and the capitulation to Hitler, which he did not even refer to parliament, Beneš simply placed the blame for every-

thing on the Western Powers, resigned and cowardly fled his country to let others sweat it out; then in 1945 he returned behind Soviet bayonets to accuse all members of the "protectorate" Czech Government and of the independent State of Slovakia of collaboration with the Nazis and treason. As far as Beneš was concerned, he was still "legally" the president, Czecho-Slovakia never ceased to exist as such, Munich never "legally" happened, the Slovaks had no right to declare their country independent, and international law was only what Beneš interpreted it to be. That was the incomparable Beneš!

The Memoirs of Dr. Eduard Beneš, like his other published works, are to all intents and purposes meant to justify everything that Dr. Beneš did, even if, in fact, it meant rendering a gross disservice to democracy and betraying not only his own people, the Czechs, but even the Slovaks and other nations as well to the men of the Kremlin. With Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini the State was supreme. And so it was with Beneš, even though he promoted the ideology of Godless, materialistic socialism in a less crude and violent fashion: the end he sought was the same. His MEMOIRS and various other works prove that, even though less eloquently and forcefully than does the "end of the road" Czecho-Slovakia reached under his guidance.

In his review, Mr. Craig does not mention that the very same MEMOIRS OF DR. EDUARD BENEŠ, translated by Godfrey Lias, were first published in 1954 by George Allen & Unwin Ltd. (London). The readers of the Times Book Review may, therefore, even as I did, purchase a book that they already have, assuming that it is an additional volume of Dr. Beneš's Memoirs. Did Mr. Craig know that?

— P. A. H.

LOUIS ŠTÚR CENTENNIAL

Joseph Kirschbaum

The year 1956 marks one hundred years since the death of one of the most eminent Slovak patriots of all time, Louis Štúr. It undoubtedly will be gratefully commemorated by Slovaks everywhere, because Štúr and his followers came upon the scene of history when the situation of the Slovaks under the Magyars in Hungary seemed to be quite hopeless. Štúr's electrifying influence is in fact responsible for the birth of modern nationalism of the Slovak nation.

When Louis Štúr was dying on January 12, 1856, from a gunshot wound accidentally inflicted during a hunting expedition, he probably never thought that the torch of national consciousness, which he had taken over from the followers of Bernolák and which he inflamed with the burning feeling and greatness of his spirit, would become a lasting light of Slovak history.

Difficult and gloomy were the times in Slovakia around the year 1855. Years after national unity was attained on the question of the language of Slovak literature, years after the revolutions of 1848-49, and after years of hopes based on the promises of the Habsburgs and on the revolutionary victories of the natural rights of enslaved nations, there came more disappointments, and the enemies of the Slovak reawakening came to life again to continue in their work against the life of the Slovak nation. The Slovaks suffered not only from the Magyar gentry, but even from some of their own intellectuals who did not believe in the viability of their nation and preferred to see it assimilated by others.

Great ideas, supported by the natural law, however, cannot die. They may be temporarily suppressed and silenced, but in the end they are always victorious. That is why enemies within and outside the Slovak nation could not destroy the concept of the individuality of the Slovak nation, its language, culture and its right to an independent life. After the passage of a hundred difficult years,

even now during the reign of Communists in Slovakia, this idea is very much alive. The victory of this idea is today crystal clear not only to Slovak intellectuals, but even to the last ordinary person in Slovakia, and to Slovaks everywhere.

In the years following World War I, several mistaken Slovak intellectuals tried to frustrate development of Slovak nationalism in the same manner that Kollár and Šafárik attempted to do in the forties of the last century. The former, however, intellectual lilliputians in comparison, were no more successful than the latter. The Slovak nation, its language, literature, and its culture outlasted all storms and betrayals. The path, cleared and beaten by the Catholic intellectuals from the University of Trnava, by Bernolák, Fándli, Hollý, and others, on to which Štúr, in the spirit of uniting the nation, led also the Protestant part of the intelligentsia and people, proved to be the salvation of the Slovak nation and a boon to its cultural and social growth.

The significance of Štúr and his group, however, is not only political, as some writers would have us believe. Like the enlightened generation of Bernolák, so the followers of Štúr were a generation with a broad learning of philosophy, history, linguistics, and literature. Writers, who would seriously write about the significance of Štúr in our national life during this centennial of his death, will also have to evaluate Štúr's role in Slovak philosophy, as was already so expertly begun (Dr. Stephen Polakovič, prof. Čiževskij, and Dr. S. S. Osuský); they will have to evaluate the work of Štúr and his followers in the field of popular education and enlightenment (Dr. Joseph Paučo published a valuable work in this direction: "Ludovýchova u štúrovcov"); also in the field of Slovak literature (as already done by Škultéty, Vajanský, Krčméry, Vlček, M. Pišút, A. Mráz, and others); and in the field of philosophy, as well.

Despite Štúr's comparatively youthful age, his education and activities were admirably many-sided. It is not without a certain amount of pride that we say that there are only a few serious works in the individual departments of Slavistics in which we do not meet with the name of L. Štúr in foreign languages and that, except for the books

written on the basis of Czech sources, they are not negative opinions.

Therefore, if in anything, besides an ardent love and sacrifice for the nation, the followers of Štúr can be a model for our generation, then it is in their thorough preparation for the role which they had marked out for themselves in Slovak life. They wanted to liberate Slovak life from smallness and isolation and, therefore, they themselves first sought a broad European education. They wanted a standard, uniform Slovak literary language, so they not only encouraged others to write in that language, but themselves also wrote expert reflections and grammars about Slovak. Their aim was a grand, beautiful Slovak literature, and they themselves created it in all branches of endeavor. They wanted to rouse the nation to self-consciousness; therefore they studied its past and revealed it to the people who knew little or nothing about it. They wanted to lift up the people from poverty and abandonment, so they went among their people, taught and trained it; they served as an example with their own lives — they did what they preached.

Because they were people, they did make mistakes, but enemies of the Slovak nation are pointing to and magnifying these in vain. Their mistakes were the mistakes of the century in which they lived, as Ernest Denis so understandingly reflected in his "*La Question d'Autriche — Les Slovaques*" in 1917. Their smallness or greatness, their reality or romanticism can be measured only against the background of the conditions and of the period in which they lived. We can justly judge them only according to the fruit which the trees planted by them bore., the results of their work which brought a new and more beautiful life to the Slovak nation. The fruits of their spiritual labor are life-giving even today and many of them are the most beautiful which the Slovak national genius has created. And this is the important thing.

Slovaks in the free world can enrich their lives to a great measure, if they acquaint themselves during this centennial of Louis Štúr with the many-sided and diversified work of Štúr and his followers. With regard to the condi-

tions under which the nation lives at home under Communism, it is our moral duty to acquaint ourselves with the endeavors of those who already over a hundred years ago warned us against the plague of Communism. With regard to the political mission of our generation, it would be to our advantage to study the ideas of Štúr, because then we shall learn that the credo and political legacy of Louis Štúr was:

"So that we ourselves might be revived and take the place in history which according to our strength and abilities belongs to us, we must once and for all free ourselves from the hated, alien yoke and gain state independence for ourselves: because a nation which is enslaved has its hands tied, its spirit stifled, and is forever threatened with the danger that sooner or later it will perish."

• • •

ŠTÚR: FATHER OF MODERN SLOVAK NATIONALISM

Marián Žiar

In 1948 Slovaks had an opportunity to assess the revolutionary events of a hundred years ago. It was our duty at that time to recall the legacy of Štúr and his followers and to appraise their political program. Unfortunately, due to circumstances beyond our control, the year 1948 was not an opportune time for a celebration of such great significance and extent as was the revolution of 1848-49.

In 1956, however, during the centennial of Štúr's death, another opportunity presents itself to ponder over the fate, the life, the struggle, and the aim of the entire generation of Štúr. Stephen Krčméry, eminent historian of Slovak literature, said that Štúr's generation began "a new chapter in the rustle-bustle of a thousand years."

Representatives of the previous generation — Hollý, Kollár and Šafárik — still lived, Slovak poets still argued about rhythm and accent, and the nation still looked for consolation in Svätopluk's Great Moravian Empire (Hollý), or to Russia — to that Slav "giant oak," as Kollár called it — when suddenly new people began to appear and new voices were heard. Kuzmány, from the distant and wide scope of his predecessors, drew attention of the world to the heart

and morality of the Slovak people. But in all these manifestations there was as yet no revolutionary dynamics, a political program was sadly lacking, and, it seems, only poets dreamed romantically about the better days to come.

Hollý and Kollár enlivened Slovak life by looking back to Slovak history and around themselves; but that was not enough for the period ahead. When Štúr and his followers came upon the scene they recognized the fact that the cultural process, begun in Slovakia already with the activity of the University of Trnava and formulated and propagated by Bernolák, had to be completed and had to serve as a basis for the political ascension of the nation.

What was realized by the merits of Štúr, Hurban and Hodža in our country in the cultural field — the codification of a uniform literary language — that was only the harvest of the products planted by past generations from the time of Balthazar Magin, Hugolín Gavlovič, and others before them. Thanks to the followers of Štúr that they became aware of the political necessity of having an independent Slovak literary language, that they did not philosophize about the maturity of Slovak nationalism but accepted it as something granted which had to be placed on a proper basis and given a proper place. Štúr understood that in his time the Slovak national process had matured and that Slovakia must appear on the scene of history as an independent political factor. It is in this that Štúr's greatest merit lies. The question did not concern any Czecho-Slovak separation, about which those like to talk who do not want to understand natural law in the development of nations. The people of Slovakia never ceased talking in Slovak and "Bible Czech" was always alien to the Slovaks even though the Slovak Protestants used it for their religious services, and even if some used it as a medium of Slovak literature. Jaroslav Vlček himself says in reference to this:

"Such a situation of things was impossible; that was the feeling of all the better Slovak spirits... Evangelical clergymen wrote in a language that was not spoken anywhere in the world; it was not typical, lacked euphony and regularity."

No foreign language, **not even Czech**, could move the Slovak people politically; only the Slovak language could do that. In five short years the latter performed a miracle; it not only stirred up life in the entire nation, but placed it under the revolutionary banners of Hurban. In short: Štúr was the first to formulate the Slovak problem, the first one moved to armed rebellion for the rights of the Slovak nation, and the first (Sept. 1848) to proclaim the independence of Slovakia ("We hereby proclaim ourselves independent of the Magyars").

In the history of the Slovak nation, no one did as much in so short a time as Štúr, who was only 41 when he died. This was possible only because the ground for the ascension of the new generation was ripe and properly prepared. Štúr approved what already existed in Slovakia; he formulated what the nation felt and demanded.

Štúr caused quite a sensation with his article "Žaloby a ponosy Slovákov v Uhorsku" (Accusations and Complaints of the Slovaks in Hungary), published in Leipzig in 1843, in which he excoriated the chief inspector of the Evangelical Church and Schools in Hungary, Count Zay, for wanting to Magyarize the Slovaks for political reasons.

Count Zay, aware of the political currents in Slovakia, in principle divided the inhabitants of Slovakia into three groups: the first concerns itself harmlessly with the Slovak language; the second yearns to establish a western-Slav kingdom under the crown of Austria; the third has secret contacts with Russia. Whether these groups really grasped the situation of those times or not is debatable, but it is quite certain that all were occupied with one thought: **to save the Slovaks from Magyarization and to secure for the Slovak nation an independent political status within the framework of the Habsburg Empire.**

"We do not want rights established on favor, but we demand our rights on the basis of right," Štúr declared. And these words became the foundation of all petitions and demands which were presented in Vienna and the Hungarian Diet in Bratislava. From this moral and democratic viewpoint also issued all of Štúr's controversies with Louis Kossuth. Writing in the name of his nation Štúr demanded

"peace based on right and mutual understanding," declaring: **"In the Pest Hirlap, Kossuth is fighting for equality of rights, but in the Diet he wants to give the orders to investigate and punish those who stand up for their rights ... That is his freedom and liberalism!"**

At the Slav Congress in Prague, 1848, again it was Štúr who together with Šafárik defined the political direction of the entire Congress. Šafárik spoke like a prophet, but Štúr was already forming a clear political program. **"Our aim should be to preserve ourselves! First of all we must serve ourselves, then others. Thus far Austria has existed but we have been perishing. What would the world say to us if we would stand for nothing else but the preservation of Austria? Let us say that we want to stand as independent Slovanic communities under the government of Austria!"**

Štúr's articles in the "Národňje Noviny," his manifestations and petitions in the Hungarian Diet, his letters to his friends — all these clearly state a clear political view: Slovakia as an independent crown land under the Habsburgs; the Slovaks must be recognized and respected as an equal partner of the other nations in the empire.

Should we wish to express Štúr's political program in terms of the political terminology of today, we would have to say: **Štúr was for a program to federalize central Europe.** He was the first Slovak who demanded equality with the rest of the nations for his own nation in the Central-European political constellation. He opposed Palacký's Austrophilism and sharply condemned Kossuth, who demanded the Magyarization of the Slovaks in the name of the right of the Hungarian State. Štúr interpreted the Slovak standpoint democratically by respecting the rights of others; he said:

"Each nation is only one part of humanity and no nation can claim for itself that it alone has comprehended best human evolution and possible perfection. Therefore, no nation has a right to force upon another nation its way of life when that nation wants to move for itself and educate itself as it sees fit..."

The way to Slovak independence was supposed to start

from the rebellion of 1848. The whole of Europe was once again in motion. After Paris, Vienna, Berlin, Prague and Italy, revolutionary explosions resounded also Hungary.

It is not important that this revolution was squashed; nor is it important that Vienna failed to fulfill the promises and expectations of the Slovaks. For history and for our generation it is only necessary to know that the Slovaks already one hundred years ago fought to change the political structure of Central Europe, that they demanded an independent status for their nation within the framework of a solid federation built on the principles of justice and equality.

Louis Štúr, preeminent leader of the Slovak movement for independence apparently was quite ahead of his time. His philosophical views, his democratic thinking and principles, his social demands, and his admiration for the democratic system in the West call for serious study and interpretation.

The controversies between Štúr and Kossuth are very interesting from the democratic point of view; they tell us how Štúr and his followers interpreted their political and social program in comparison to Kossuth, **who wanted democracy only for the Magyars at the expense of the other nations of Hungary.** Štúr, a member of the Protestant Evangelical Church, was not afraid to accept and complete the work of preceding Catholic generations to preserve the heritage of the Slovak nation. We must recall for ourselves and for the free world that the Slovaks played a serious political role in the revolutionary movement in Central Europe in 1848-49, and that already at that time they clearly formulated a political program which satisfies even the demands of the present time, so that on it the contemporary Slovak generation can build its own, modern program of federalization.

Štúr belongs among the greatest of European revolutionaries of his time. The Magyars gratefully built Kossuth a monument in free America, and the Czechs have one of Masaryk in Chicago. If they deserved to be remembered, surely Štúr, who was a greater apostle of democracy and freedom for all people, should be no less honored in the

land of the free and the home of the brave. Americans of Slovak descent should give this serious thought during Štúr's centennial.

The nation which produced Joseph Milan Hurban, Paul Joseph Šafárik, John Kollár, John Hollý, John Chalúpka, Johnny Král', Andrew Sládkovič, Jonah Záborský, John Palárik, John Kalinčiak, Peter Bohúň, Joseph Božetech Klemens, and Dionýz Štúr — is not a small nation.

The shining light among the Slovaks of the nineteenth century, the formulator of their program, and the interpreter of their desires was Louis Štúr — **the father of modern Slovak nationalism.**

• • •

ŠTÚR'S GROUP IN THE SERVICE OF THE PEOPLE **Joseph Paučo**

Štúr's school exerted every effort to serve the people from which it descended in order to elevate it intellectually and to save it from physical and spiritual decline. Whatever was attempted in the cultural, economic, and social fields, all closely allied with the efforts in the political field, was done with these aims in mind.

From the beginning of their public activity, the Štúr-ites were aware of the fact that they could elevate the people entrusted to and dependent on them only if they themselves could obtain the authority which would give them a moral right to reach and lead the Slovak people. For this they prepared thoroughly. Their moral principles are connected with perseverance, courage and nobility. The Institute of the Slovak Language and Literature in Bratislava already had thus formed the young and fiery souls; without morality, the first prerequisite, no one could get into the Institute. Therefrom emanated the rest of the obligations of the members, such as love for Slovak, perseverance in preparing and presenting lectures, or in performing tasks outside the Institute. Whosoever is moral will not become lost; therein was the assurance and safeguard. From this morally strengthened youth glowed a fire which overextended the framework of purely internal work. Gradually the followers of Štúr came into contact with the

Slovak public. The "Plody" (Fruits), "Jitřenka" (Morning Star), Hurban's "Nitra," Palkovič's "Tatranka" (Tatra News), Kuzmány's "Hronka" (Hron News), and Fejérpataky's "Nový i starý vlastenecký kalendár" (The New and the Old Patriotic Almanac)—all these worthy periodicals resulted from the enthusiasm of clean hearts and the noble characters of Štúr's group.

These endeavors, as well as the contacts of the youth with the public during vacation, were the next to the last step for the Štúrites in their preparation to devote themselves with all their strength to the needs of the people. They had hardly left their school benches when the interest of their people became one of their desires; all were willing to serve in the capacity they were best fitted for.

When they left school the followers of Štúr returned to their people, lived with them, toiled with them, and bore the burdens of the day with them. They knew the virtues and shortcomings of the Slovaks. They realized that social and economic ills were caused by the ruling Magyars and decided to do something about it. They knew that to save their people, they had to educate them politically and correct the mistakes of the past (1).

After God, the people were nearest and dearest to the Štúrites. They did not fear the people, despite the fact that the Slovaks were referred to in the most derogatory manner. The Magyars said that the Slovaks were stupid, but the Štúrites knew that the Slovaks were a simple but very able and capable people. Probably the greatest fault of the Slovaks was that they were very obedient and addicted to certain failings. The latter, however, could be removed, and the Štúrites set themselves to that very task (2).

The greater the pressure of the opposition, the more profound the reaction of the Štúrites. Pressure evoked resistance; as one voice there resounded in Slovakia: "Everything for our Slovak people" (3).

They helped their humiliated and neglected people by all means at their disposal, because they knew that above all else it was necessary to lead the people to the point where it could liberate itself from the mistakes and symptoms of slavery, and then complete freedom would follow.

That meant that the Štúrites were for the people with their whole being; they listened patiently to all complaints and protests, and sympathized with their misery; and, of course, were determined to fight against all injustices (4). One of them summarized the work of the followers of Štúr thusly: "Štúr's school became one of the most effective factors in the life of the Slovak nation" (5).

The followers of Štúr concerned themselves with the welfare of the entire nation. They fought to improve their economy, but they also fought with equal vigor against alcoholism, indifference, and illiteracy. They labored to uplift the spirit and to rouse nation consciousness not only by speaking and writing, but by their practical work among all classes of their people, visiting even the lowliest to transform their minds and to use their strength so that they might save themselves from ruin (6).

And the Slovak people responded wholeheartedly when Štúr began to publish his "Slovenskje Národnje Novini" and the "Orol Tatranský"—which became a power that had to be reckoned with, because they found favor with the common people, the intelligentsia and the gentry (7). Without unity there could be no strength, but there could be no unity without education and mutual understanding. The Štúrites preached respect for individuals, but in all considerations the nation as a whole came first, and the nation's welfare called for sacrifices (8). They pointed to the common property, the heritage of the Slovak people—its language, morals, customs and its homeland—which unites the nation as a whole and commands it to go forward toward its goal unitedly. It is in this union that we must seek the rights of individuals, the assurance of freedom, prosperity and spiritual values. Words, written or spoken, help, but without deeds they mean nothing. Work and more persevering work is necessary.

The nation must feel that some one is backing it up, really concerned about its welfare. Sentiment and justice must protect everyone equally. Thus we can elevate the people and help it; and only thus can we attain complete national unity. People must be dealt with humanely; this applies to individuals and entire groups, as well.

The Štúrites dealt humanly with their nation; they elevated and united it into one moral unit, so that it would not fail in its resolves, but that its national feelings, its nobility and all its desires would get proper expression. Material and spiritual servitude hurt equally — both tend to kill — and, therefore, the united nation must oppose both resolutely (9).

The followers of Štúr knew why they had to appeal to the mind, the feelings and the character of their nation; also why they had to hit those who oppressed it. The Slovaks were threatened with complete annihilation. There was danger that the one and the other side might resort to extremes. The Štúrites had to harden the Slovaks to face realities; they knew that every battle was won by those who were stronger, better prepared and hardened (10). Štúr and his followers knew they could gain practically nothing without first uniting their nation. They took their work seriously and were guided by the principle that renegades are punished even by God, because they sin grievously against the rights of their people (11). Their task was not to convert renegades, but to teach their people to help themselves, to recognize and fight for their God-given rights.

Štúr realized the importance of newspapers, hence took it upon himself to establish a Slovak newspaper. He applied for permission to publish a Slovak newspaper, but his request was not allowed until three years later, after many trips and letters to Budapest and Vienna. When the SLOVENSKJE NÁRODŇJE NOVINI (Slovak National News) and its supplement, the TATRANSKÝ OROL (Eagle of the Tatras), finally were issued, the Slovaks received them with great joy and subscribed to them. The papers served their mission well for three years, when they were confiscated by the government, uniting the people, teaching and entertaining them, and encouraging them during the most stirring times in their history. Štúr's newspapers served all strata of Slovaks, the intelligentsia, the laborer, the peasant, the minister of the Gospel, the merchant, and the tradesman. The Magyars soon realized what the papers were doing for the Slovak people and raised an alarm to have them outlawed. But there can be no denying the fact

that they had fulfilled their mission well. The Slovaks did awaken nationally; without the newspapers Štúr and his followers would not have achieved the success they did in uniting the Slovaks in so short a time.

Štúr and his followers were realists. They came out of the people and worked with the people to uplift them. They knew their joys and sorrows, the difficulties that beset them; the misery and injustices suffered by them. But they knew, too, that complaining and whining about the sad lot of the Slovaks would not help to do away with injustice and poverty. So they encouraged the people to help themselves by overcoming indolence and ignorance, and becoming enterprising; to abandon ancient methods in the trades and agriculture and the schools and to learn the new, more efficient ways of doing things in all fields of endeavor.

Štúr and his school are responsible for a wealth of literature about the school question, the necessity of cultivating the native language, the significance of enlightenment, the theatre, reading societies and libraries, Slovak agriculture and industry, money, taxes, animal husbandry, and a host of other subjects. They organized temperance societies and cultural and social institutions; and taught in Sunday schools. The movement of Štúr was probably the most interesting movement of all time in Slovakia. Štúr and his followers were not idle dreamers, but practical idealists who really had the welfare and security of their Slovak people at heart. They shall always be remembered by a grateful Slovak nation.

1. Compare Milan Pišút: "Počiatky básnickej školy Štúrovej" (The Beginnings of Štúr's Poetical School), Bratislava, 1938, pp. 116, 251.
2. "Slovenskje Národnje Novini," Vol. 2, No. 61, p. 244.
3. P. Z. Hostinský in the SNN, Vol. 4, No. 278, p. 1109.
4. SNN, Vol. 2, No. 84, p. 333, etc.
5. Ján Francisci: "Vlastný životopis" (My Own Biography), Turč. Sv. Martin, 1909, p. 38.
6. This is upheld also by Dr. Joseph Miloslav Hurban in his biography of Štúr: "Slovenské Pohľady" (Slovak Views), 1833, p. 74, etc.
7. Daniel Rapant came to the same conclusion in his "Dejiny slovenského povstania r. 1848-49" (Book 1, p. 170), where he states: "Štúr's newspapers were read in the towns and villages, even in the court-yards of the more sensitive and nationally more preserved lower

- nobility. The voice of this national organ under Štúr was a real power that had to be reckoned with.”
8. Compare M. Pišút, above, p. 181.
 9. L. Štúr in the article “Naše položenje vo vlasti” (Our Situation in the Homeland), Slov. Nár. Novini, Vol. 2, Nos. 117-120, pp. 467-68; 471-72; 475-76; 479-80.
 10. Štúr in the Diet, March 10, 1848: “I do not like to refer to historical rights, because I believe that he who shows strength also assumes the right...”, SNN, Vol. 3, No. 270, p. 1078.
 11. M. Pišút, above, p. 188.

• • •

WHO SAID IT?

“Communism not only commits outrageous injustice against all civil society..., but it also ruins all personal initiative, self-determination, endeavor, and enthusiasm; it absolutely precludes generous, active fraternal charity... It divides the family, it destroys the household and thus it opens wide the door to every type of immorality, dissolution, and indulgence. It shatters all the bonds of social living. In place of holy ties, it offers profiteering, rioting, and their like and thus it degrades man to animal level.

“Communism, then, has matured to the same degree as atheism and defection from Christianity... In all types of communism, whatever their classification may be, the outlook is only toward a dismal life denied any ennobling joys. It brings in its wake despotism of the grossest kind.

“Let communism busy itself, making every endeavor and every righteous representation it will, protesting that it aims to secure the rights of the people, the fact remains that it knows nothing about humanity. It degrades it deplorably. And because it cleaves to its tenets which are impractical and unrealizable, it ranks among the wildest of offshoots ever conceived by the human brain.” — (Louis Štúr: SLOVANSTVO A SVET BUDÚCNOSTI (Slavdom and the World of the Future).

• • •

You can help the righteous cause of the Slovak people — their fight against Communism and for their freedom and independence — by sending a contribution to the Slovak League of America: Mr. Milan V. Blazek, treasurer, 4922 S. Leclair Avenue, Chicago 38, Ill.

A CLOSE-UP VIEW OF RADIO FREE EUROPE

By Jiri Brada

(From January, February, and March, 1956, issues of "FACTS FORUM,"
Dallas, Texas)

Radio Free Europe, a network of stations which has been set up in western Europe for the purpose of sending anti-Communist broadcasts to the peoples on the other side of the Iron Curtain, is a division of Free Europe Committee, Inc. The latter, a private organization, was founded in 1949 by a group of American citizens, among whom the Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, U. S. Senator from New York, played a prominent role.

In 1950, the Free Europe Committee started its annual fund-raising drive under the name of Crusade for Freedom. Most of us, at one time or another, have been exposed to the propaganda of this powerful organization, via newspapers, radio, television, freedom cars, and freedom trains, and most of us have read and heard about FEC's much-publicized freedom balloons.

The Free Europe Committee claims that millions of its funds have been contributed by more than twenty-five million American citizens. Many more millions of dollars, though, have been donated by corporations, including some of the large foundations.

Henry Ford II, whose Ford Foundation through the years has been a heavy contributor, is national chairman of the Crusade for Freedom. As such he is the successor of General Lucius D. Clay. Other prominent sponsors of the project include David Sarnoff, Edward R. Murrow, Harold E. Stassen, Walter S. Gifford, Samuel Unger, George Barasch, C. B. Tibbets, and Joseph J. Fliesser. Headquarters of the Crusade is 29 West 57th Street, New York City.

C. D. Jackson, in crucial years one of President Eisenhower's "palace guard," headed the Free Europe Committee for a considerable length of time. Whitney H. Shepardson is its current president.

Joseph C. Grew, former U. S. Ambassador to Japan, is Chairman of the Board of the Free Europe Committee. Arthur W. Page is Chairman of the Executive Committee.

Vice presidents include W. J. C. Eagan, Levering Tyson, Samuel S. Walker, Jr., and Bernard Yarrow. John C. Tra-phagen serves as treasurer, Theodore C. Augustine as secretary and assistant treasurer, and J. Clayton Miller as assistant secretary. On March 15, 1955, Herbert H. Lang was replaced as Director of Radio Free Europe by W. J. C. Eagan.

The Board of Directors, besides several of the above-named, is composed of A. A. Berle, David K. E. Bruce, Jr., Frederick R. Dolbeare, Julius Fleischmann, H. B. Miller, Irving S. Olds, George U. Shuster, Charles M. Spofford, and H. Gregory Thomas.

Among additional sponsors of the Free Europe Committee we find such nationally known figures as Clarence L. Adcock, Raymond Pace Alexander, Laird Bell, Francis Biddle, Robert Woods Bliss, Robert F. Bradford, Harry A. Bullis, Cecile B. De Mille, Frank R. Denton, William J. Donovan, Mark F. Ethridge, James A. Farley, Virginia C. Gildersleeve, Charles R. Hook, Palmer Hoyt, Paul Kesten, Henry R. Luce, Joseph V. McKee, Web Maddox, H. B. Miller, Samuel E. Morison, Frederick Osborn, John W. Sibley, Spyros Skouras, Charles P. Taft, DeWitt Wallace, W. W. Waymack, Walter H. Wheeler, Jr., Charles E. Wilson, Mrs. Quincy Wright, and Darryl Zanuck. The 1952 list of national sponsors also featured James B. Carey, Allen W. Dulles, William Green, and Matthew Woll. Besides a sprinkling of men who uphold America's traditions of limited government and the free market economy, there is the usual contingent of ancient and ubiquitous New Dealers.

Headquarters of the Free Europe Committee is a few stone's throws from that of the Crusade for Freedom, at 110 West 57th Street, New York City.

The political and ideological influence of the Free Europe Committee spans continents. No organization in the world exerts more power over the refugees from eastern Europe. It practically maintains a monopoly on placing refugee students in American colleges. It controls the University College at Strassbourg, France.

Besides the periodical, **News from Behind the Iron Curtains**, the Free Europe Committee has published num-

erous booklets and pamphlets on communism in eastern Europe.

Radio Free Europe, which is located at the Committee's headquarters, 110 West 57th Street, is thus but one, though no doubt the most important, department of the Free Europe Committee.

While officially a division of a private organization, Radio Free Europe does of course not devise any arbitrary policy of its own. It has been conceived as a private arm of the American government's foreign policy and as such reflects the respective competence or confusion of Washington.

The principal editorial offices of Radio Free Europe, while taking their cues from New York and Washington, are located in Europe, especially in western Germany. European headquarters is at English Gardens (Englischer Garten) 1, Munich 23, Germany. Richard J. Condon is European director. The largest broadcasting stations of Radio Free Europe are located outside of Munich and Frankfurt on the Main. Their principal programs are broadcast in the various languages of Communist-dominated peoples, such as Czech, Slovak, Hungarian, Roumanian, Bulgarian, Albanian, and Polish.

Influence of Soviet Postwar Policy

In order to grasp the policy of these programs, it is well worth recalling the Soviet postwar policy in the satellite nations of eastern Europe. For the sake of appearance and expediency, no outright Communist governments were set up by the USSR immediately upon the end of World War II. Instead, there arose the so-called governments of "national fronts" or "people's fronts" or "popular fronts."

Moscow's commissars saw to it that no parties of the real center nor, of course, any of the right wing movements were admitted to these fronts; but even the non-Communist left wing parties, such as those of the Socialists or Social Democrats, were from the outset largely led by puppets of the Soviet Union, many of whom had up to then lived in comparative obscurity.

Within the course of a few months or years respective-

ly, these non-Communist leftist parties were forged into total tools of the global Communist conspiracy. Freedom of election, assembly and press were abolished; trade and industry were nationalized; non-conformists, by means of the "people's courts," were crushed, and "national committees," viz. soviets, soon dictated and strangled all branches of public and private life.

Thoughtful readers may wonder why so many of the Socialist-minded collaborators were in due time permitted by the Communist authorities to leave their countries. They cannot help being amazed to learn that it is mainly these collectivistic refugees from the satellite nations whom Radio Free Europe has entrusted with program-controlling positions. There Marxians and statists were ballyhooed as "victims" of Soviet persecution, while practically all those who had escaped from the Communists when the Russian armies swept over their countries, i.e., those who at all times had steadfastly opposed the Communist menace, were systematically excluded from Radio Free Europe.

Is it possible that a good many of these Socialist twin brothers of the Communists were not prevented from reaching our side of the Iron Curtain because on the basis of their Marxist past they were likely to confuse and adulterate the crusade of the free world? Is it possible that some of them even promised merely to pose as foes of communism, and therefore in reality continued their collaboration with the Communists in the guise of foes? At any rate, quite a few of these recent allies of the Communists are now earning considerable fees from the funds of the Crusade for Freedom, in payment of their ineffectual and phony psychological warfare.

Former Red Confederates in Top Jobs

The real champions of political and economic freedom, the real opponents of state intervention, the real adversaries of materialism, atheism and tyranny were either rejected or fired by Radio Free Europe, and are now sitting on the side lines. The men of the Kremlin should indeed be pleased with this curious policy of Radio Free Europe.

To be sure, RFE's bosses offer us a ready-made excuse

for employing so many former Soviet collaborators in top positions. No one, they aver, is more thoroughly aware of Communist deviousness than are those who have experienced Communist tactics in practice. However—and this is the crux of the matter—not one of these former confederates of the Communists has come forth with any protest against his former collaboration, and none of the former Communists on Radio Free Europe has come forth with any protest against his former communism. They shun the role of the repentant sinner. They all of a sudden pose as experts of the democratic way, as pioneers of individual, personal freedom. The Whittaker Chambers type is excluded.

By no means have all of these men merely posed as anti-Communists while in ever so many instances they could not help going soft on the Communist line. A great many, being Socialists, have been so blind with regard to limited governmental and the free market economy, and still are such loyal believers in the benefits of Socialist intervention, planning and control, that they consistently devise policies which play into the hands of the Communists by appeasing them.

The Polish, Czechoslovak and Hungarian broadcasting stations of Radio Free Europe, which equal the power of the German station in Munich, i. e., 50,000 watts, run programs for 20 hours a day. Numerous short wave stations send broadcasts in the various idioms of eastern Europe three or four hours daily. It is claimed that 29 RFE stations are now functioning.

The Czechoslovak station near Munich is as strong as that of Munich or that of the American Forces network, in that city. In operation since May 1, 1951, it covers political commentaries; daily commentaries; the international situation (transmitted from New York offices); programs for workers, peasants, women, young people, and children; economics; history; music; entertainment, etc., and news every hour on the hour.

Source Material Far Left of Center

The over-all ideology of these programs is largely determined by former members of the Czechoslovak National

Front, i.e., one-time Communist collaborators. From time to time, these men receive written instructions of specific subjects from the New York offices where left-wingers set the tone. Dr. Martin Kvetko and Dr. Julius First, known and prominent former pro-Communists, instruct all editors at regular meetings.

Carefully selected books on communism, clippings from such American publications as *The New York Times*, *The New York Herald Tribune*, *Time*, *Life*, etc., items from the press of American labor unions, material from Communist papers on both sides of the Curtain, and monitored texts of the Czechoslovak Communist radio represent the source material from which the script writers draw. There are also special "intelligence" reports. Straight conservative papers and magazines are taboo at Radio Free Europe.

Script writers know how to toe the line. They know that they might as well look for another job if they dare use material or ideas from the *Chicago Tribune* or such of our magazines as *American Mercury*, *American Legion Magazine*, *Christian Economics*, *Human Events*, *National Review* and *National Republic*.

To summarize — RFE programs are shaped according to the directives of (a) the American bosses and (b) the hired leftist National Frontiers from eastern Europe. The rank and file Socialist or otherwise leftist editors are either unintelligent or servile or both, and grind out their chores in accordance with their orders.

Actually, RFE policies vary only in degree, but not in substance, from other psychological warfare stations of the free world. These include Radio Free Asia, station RIAS in Berlin, Radio Liberation — a private American station which broadcasts to peoples inside the USSR — and of course the Voice of America. None of them takes a consistent stand against the philosophy of government intervention and government control, none of them — except for occasional and half-hearted lip service — champions freedom of enterprise. No wonder that so far our psychological warfare has failed.

In order to document for American readers what sort of ideas are being transmitted to the Iron Curtain world

by their expensively staffed freedom stations, I have for some years gathered from RFE Czechoslovak programs a substantial collection of radio scripts and tape recordings, from which I shall quote in the following. If any slogan may be offered to characterize the general tenor of all too many programs, let us quote what a well-known American apologist for the Soviet causes has said in the process of the Far Eastern debacle: "Let them fall, but do not let it appear that we pushed them."

Propagation of Socialism

May 1, 1953, 3:15 p. m.: "The Socialist youth of the whole world sends its greetings to the youth of Czechoslovakia. We assure you that we shall reach the aim... the day, when we will be able to join you in democracy in the fight for socialism, social justice and freedom." At the end of the program the **International** was played. (The **International** is the rallying song of world communism.)

May 3, 1953, 12:15 p. m.: Ferdinand Peroutka, chief of RFE's Czechoslovak desk in New York, a well-known Socialist and one-time prominent member of the pro-Communist National Front, in his "Sunday Comments of Ferdinand Peroutka": "Eisenhower's program, on the other hand, even though America's factories have not been nationalized, stands for the concept of world socialism. There is no better way to describe it. This is socialism... The aim of the program outlined by the President of the United States is to socialize life."

May 1, 1954, 2:50 p. m.: "Today, on May 1st, we convey our greetings to all those who are dedicated to the faith in democratic socialism." (To Communist-dominated countries May 1st is synonymous with America's July 4th, and the term "Democratic Socialism" is a Communist term used in May Day speeches to describe Communist ideology.)

May 4, 1954, 2:10 p. m.: "Program for Workers: "Léon Jouhaux — a great man, descended from a family in which revolutionism has been a tradition. His father participated in the revolt of the Paris Commune... a born revolutionary..."

GANSER LIBRARY

MILLERSVILLE STATE COLLEGE

May 5, 1954, 2:10 p. m.: "Léon Jouhaux — a great revolutionary, a great reformer..."

March 23, 1955, 12:40 p. m. Program, "We Call the Communist Party": "The present order (in eastern Europe) merely serves to continue the dictatorship... this jungle which falsely is labeled as legitimate socialism."

March 23, 2:20 p. m. Dr. Jan Hajek, on program, "Living Science — Discussion with Young People," said: "Socialism has become adult. Socialist thinkers are no longer irresponsible radicals. The fundamental problem of modern socialism is man's relation to the state.

"The modern socialist rejects both extremes — *laissez faire* and state control. He is aware of his duties as well as his rights.

"The citizens of the Socialist society must be conscious of their heritage, and proud of it."

Along this line, the Czechoslovak editors and broadcasters carefully avoid repudiating the measures of socialization and communization which their own National Front had instituted in the postwar years, and often go so far as to approve of similar Communist measures in satellite Europe. Thus, on October 28, 1952, at 11:50 a. m., the broadcaster of "We Call the Communist Party," exclaimed: "Seven years ago, the decrees of the President of the Republic brought forth the nationalization of industry. In this way Czechoslovakia set out on her way of democratic independence."

Socialist Policies Defended

These psychological warriors of the RFE thus still don't realize that it was a crime to cooperate with the Communists, or if they do, they don't admit it. There is never any hint that the Socialist policies of the National Front as such have led to disaster, no inkling that socialism, because it infringes upon the rights of the individual, leads to communism. Therefore, these so-called freedom broadcasters never point out that the misery of the people in eastern Europe largely derives from Socialist meddling with the affairs of the people; they blame it all on Soviet exploitation, armaments, emphasis on heavy industry, and that sort of thing.

Yes, they have mentioned the "forced Communist economy." What they mean by it may be seen from "International Commentary from New York," in its broadcast April 18, 1953, at 6:05 p. m. The broadcaster explained that "this means in Czechoslovakia the return of the former export policy, the return to the production of quality articles. To put an end to this over-emphasis on heavy industry must be the goal of our new democratic way."

That is all. No reference to liberation from the Socialist bureaucracy, from Socialist oppression. Just a shift from armaments to quality products. Nothing more.

Ferdinand Peroutka, in his broadcast of Sunday, April 27, 1952, at 12:15 p. m., declared: "The Communists lie when they tell you that we want to restore capitalism, that we intend to return to the proprietors the property which has been taken from them some time ago . . . I repeat: the program of the Czechoslovak exiles is not capitalism and the return to 1938. Nor do we wish to hand back the mines and foundries to their former owners. All we care for is that the Communist government, which means dependence on Russia, disappears."

It might be argued that an occasional program of this sort might have its place in the over-all setup because, after all, there still are old Socialists in Czechoslovakia who have no use for the Communists. Yet isn't it strange that while there are programs for workers, peasants and Communists, there are none for businessmen?

Sometimes they talk about free competition, but often it is but the competition of collectively owned factories amongst themselves. The terminology of their broadcasts is of the Socialist variety, including the trite ranting against "Capitalists" and "reactionaries".

I now shall proceed to offer documentary evidence to show that Radio Free Europe also aids, and sometimes even propagates, Titoism and communism, and frequently extols Communist leaders.

Milos Vanek, one-time big wheel in the Communist party of Czechoslovakia, and now chief of the economics department of RFE's Czechoslovak desk, said on November 21, 1952, at 11.30 a. m.: "Marx, Engels, Trotsky—for them

Marxism was the substitute for the Western revolution of human rights."

The commentator of "Weekly Survey of the American Press," on April 12, 1953, at 8:30 a. m., said: "The New York Herald Tribune is of the opinion that the trial of Mindszenty, the Hungarian cardinal, as well as the trial of Slansky and similar crimes in other Communist countries, ought to be remembered..."

Possibly, if not probably, it was one of the numerous left-wingers on the staff of the Tribune who planted this corrupting little seed of associating the fearless anti-Communist cardinal with that old Marxian wheelhorse and Kremlin errand boy, Slansky-Salzmann, who stood as solidly for the Leninist-Stalinist program as any Communist who happened to get purged in some intra-party feud. Sure enough, if the Tribune man did not give a ring to his pal at the Czechoslovak desk in New York's RFE headquarters, the latter did not fail to pick up that choice tidbit.

After all, any "opinion" of the staid and presumably conservative New York Herald Tribune is safe quoting. Who is there brazen enough to accuse the old Tribune of being subversive? And thus, by association with a primate and martyr of the Roman Catholic Church, a Communist lickspittle is being groomed for respectability. And this in the name of fighting the totalitarian enemy, by an organization which is financed by American donations, and which is sponsored by well-known Americans.

Again and again, RFE's psychological warriors do not attack Marxism-communism as such but what, with tears of regret, they condemn is its "degeneracy." Consequently, the listener—unless he be quite alert—is induced to fancy that communism, with which so many RFE bigwigs once cooperated, would not be so bad if only it had not "degenerated."

RFE Attacks Russian Imperialism but not Communism

Fiddling that tune, RFE's "Europe without the Iron Curtain," on March 2, 1952, at 3:45 p. m., complained about the "degeneration of the old Communist ideals."

Commenting on the arrest of the Kremlin-serving boss-

es Sling, Clementis and Slansky, RFE's "Comments on Events of the Day," on February 13, 1952, at 7:30 p. m., waxed somewhat melancholic: "They consciously closed their eyes, dreaming about the Communist security of the future... they dreamed ... what was to remain of the ideals once the dream had come to an end?... A cynical disdain for Communist ideals..."

Karol Belak-Berger, the left wing Socialist, in RFE's "Round Table Discussion," on April 12, 1953, at 3:05 p. m., nostalgically referred to the "millions of idealists and men of good will" who had believed in communism and merely deplored the "methods" that had "failed." Regretfully he mused that "the whole appeal of communism has evaporated..."

The policy of collaboration with the Communists was quite distinctly expressed by the old Socialist comrade, Ferdinand Peroutka, in his "Sunday Comments" of April 27, 1952, at 12:15 p. m., when he answered the attack of the Communist daily, Rudé Právo, on exiles such as he. "It accuses us of working for the restoration of capitalism, along with the return of the western powers," stated Peroutka.

"All we wish to say in reply to these accusations is this:

"There has been a Socialist government in England for six years. This government would hardly have forced you, the Czech and Slovak people, to accept capitalism. Today we have a Conservative government in England. Yet it has not abolished any of the Labor government's Socialist measures, and it would not do anything of the sort in Czechoslovakia.

"As to America—she supports Tito. Now even though Tito accepts America's bountiful assistance with open hands, the United States government has not demanded the denationalization of a single Yugoslav factory. Yes, Tito never ceased to be a Communist. America says: 'Let everyone do as he pleases.' America says: 'Go ahead and be a Communist if that's what you want. All we ask is that you stop supporting Russian imperialism.' America has no intention

to force anyone, including Czechoslovakia, to return to capitalism."

Dr. Miloslav Kohak, another widely known one-time Communist collaborator of the National Front who saved his skin in the nick of time and landed a fat job as chief (until his replacement recently) of RFE's "Political Comments on the Situation at Home," on November 25, 1952, at 10:45 a. m., had this to say about Arthur London:

"From beginning to end, the indictment against London is preposterous. It is the whole International Brigade of the Civil War in Spain which is being attacked in his person—another proof of the reactionary attitude now prevailing in the Soviet Union. She no longer wants the support of men who believe in ideals, but only of those who believe in bayonets."

On May 8, 1954, at 5:45 p. m., in "Stories Written by Life," a young Communist inmate of a slave labor camp was quoted as follows: "Your Christian concept comes close to the original Leninist ideology... We must work together, faithful to the ideas which Lenin has taught us."

Dr. Jaroslav Stransky, Socialist and an old Communist collaborator of the National Front, said in "Talk with Home," on March 1, 1952, at 9:30 p. m.: "Denunciation should not play any part in politics... Any honest Communist will join the rest of us in condemning denunciation."

Probably the old collaborator still believes that it is possible for Communists to be honest. Consequently he had no trouble in slipping that one in. The trouble with Radio Free Europe, though, is quite another matter. Squandering millions of American dollars for the alleged purpose of fighting communism, it hires old Communist collaborators who rant about "honest" Communists.

"We Call the Communist Party," of February 22, 1952, at 11:45 a. m., went all out in praise of Communist cultural achievements. "Czech Communist literature has brought forth works of outstanding value," RFE's psychological warrior declared. "We enjoy reading Communist authors as much as any others."

A curious way of inducing an anti-Communist attitude, to say the least.

The Socialist Franta Klatil, in "Political Comments on the Situation at Home," on April 21, 1953, at 11:45 a. m., mused that "Tito has more character than his one-time allies in Prague... He secured his independence, and quite thoroughly at that."

It is quite a common procedure for Radio Free Europe to quote Tito and Red Yugoslavia's press as authorities in both moral and political matters. Holiday trips to Tito's Yugoslavia have become a cherished habit of RFE's editors.

Programs Glorify Revolutionary Workers

Another variety of the collectivist ideology which prevails among RFE editors is the frequent praise of those enemies of the Kremlin who have not been able to toe the party line but have otherwise been valuable fighters in the class struggle against the so-called exploiters. Thus, the RFE script, "We Call the Communist Party," which was broadcast to Czechoslovakia on March 29, 1955, at 12:40 p. m., in its glorification of the revolutionary workers of Kronstadt sounds as if it had been written by the old Lithuanian-American anarchist Alexander Berkman. "The workers of Kronstadt," it says in that script, "fought so that the soviets may be elected freely and democratically, that their just demands be fulfilled—demands which were entirely in the spirit of the October Revolution. They fought for democratic soviets..."

True enough, this broadcast was addressed to Communists, and it might seem reasonable to some to appeal to Communists in the spirit of genuine communism; but is it likely that hardened trans-Curtain Communists of 1955 believe in appeals in behalf of communism when they are uttered by those who are hired by Americans? Yet, incredible though it may appear, that is the line which RFE commentators adopted as late as 1955.

Let us choose another example of this folly by quoting Dr. Jaroslav Stransky, former minister of the National Front, in his "Commentary on the Political Situation" of April 2, 1955, 9:50 a. m. In this gem of an "anti-Communist" broadcast, the Communist collaborator of but a few years ago sang the praise of the "Spartacus Bund," the

militant group which, following World War I, broke away from Germany's left wing Socialists in order to usher in the Communist revolution. Stransky really waxed lyrical over Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, the two most prominent and violent leaders of early German communism.

"The modern Spartacus movement," pontificated Stransky in behalf of RFE's version of freedom, "Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg ... they were pacifists, the foes of imperialism and militarism ... they were beaten to death by the mob ... their articles, their speeches, their letters were inspired by a vision of order and beauty for the modern world ... in every sentence which that undersized, ungainly Jewess, Luxemburg, wrote, there was humaneness and poesy ..."

We are not arguing about the lofty intentions of these two world famous pioneers of the Communist revolution, misguided and unbalanced though they were. We are here questioning the wisdom of Americans who, in the name of the freedom for which Washington and Lincoln lived and died, hire a notorious one-time Communist collaborator who still offers hymns to the cause of the Communist revolution. That Stransky should express such revolutionary feelings is obvious; that well-meaning Americans should sponsor such project does provide food for thought.

National Fronts Vaunted

In line with this farcically suicidal policy these RFE psychological warriors naturally still vaunt the very National Front which paved the way for the total subjugation of the Czech and Slovak people by the Communists. These strange refugee policy-makers, script-writers and editors still live in that dreary world in which fatal short-sightedness delivered their people into the hands of the Kremlin.

Thus, on October 28, 1952, at 10:05 a. m., these so-called heralds of freedom told the home folks behind the Curtain: "There will once more be a time when Beneš will arise ..." On October 27, 1953, at 4:35 p. m., they appealed to "those who remember the pre-February (i. e., 1945-48) democracy ..." On January 11, 1953, at 11:30 a. m., the leftist Socialist Belak-Berger, "in Comments on the Events

of the Day," exclaimed: "The real National Front (i. e., peaceful Socialist-Communist collaborators) today lives in the hearts of the Czechs and Slovaks."

As if there had not been mass murders all over Czechoslovakia throughout the existence of the National Front, RFE's "Time, Men, Events" of October 18, 1952, at 10:15 a. m., told the good people behind the Curtain that "the conditions of 1945 actually originated in the will and the wish of the majority of the people."

New York "Comments of the International Situation," on April 12, 1952, decried the "Communist treason" of February, 1948, by which the last collaborators of the National Front were expelled by the Kremlin's agents. "The Communists," this broadcast said, "seized power by means of the militia and the police... Before this time (i. e., before February, 1948, during the entire time of the National Front) the democratic politicians had proved their good will to cooperate (with the Communists... However) the democratic politicians (the National Front men and today the RFE men) were removed..."

This is of course true, as all of us know. Yet what sort of democrats are Communist collaborators who tacitly consent or actively connive at the suppression and murder of political non-conformists? These National Fronters, now employed by RFE, did not discover the criminality of their Communist allies when moderates and conservatives were systematically murdered. Only when the Communists put the finishing touches on the enslavement of the Czechoslovak people by exterminating their own collaborators did these curious freedom fighters belatedly decide that the Kremlin's henchmen were after all poor champions of liberty.

Yet whom do the American bosses of Radio Free Europe select for speaking to the enslaved people of Czechoslovakia? Not those who from the beginning refused to compromise with the Communist tyrants. They have preferred to choose such National Fronters as Dr. Petr Zenkl, Dr. Joseph Lettrich, Vaclav Majer, Dr. Ivo Duchacek, and Dr. Jaroslav Stransky. The latter has been offered as a weekly feature attraction.

Like Alger Hiss, who still maintains that Yalta was "a good thing," but that the bad Communists unfortunately broke their pledges, these National Fronters claim that their collaborator with the Communists—the so-called Košice Program—would have been "a good thing" if only the Communists had not proved to be treacherous. Instead of at last admitting that the Košice Program was criminal folly from the outset, they still refer to it as an "ideal."

In 1955, when the Communists in Czechoslovakia celebrated the 10th anniversary of the Košice Program, RFE's "Head and Tail," in a broadcast of April 5, at 8:15 a. m., declared: "Communist propaganda appeals to democracy, i.e., to the ideals which the Communists have betrayed."

On April 7, 1955, at 12:40 p. m., RFE's "We Call the Communist Party" still praised the Košice government program, "according to which the Czechoslovak people were to elect their representatives in free and secret elections." This whitewashing of the Košice Program is a deliberate falsehood because only four left wing parties then were handed out licenses by the Communist masters while all anti-Communist parties were declared illegal.

The Kersten Committee of the U. S. House of Representatives has put this sham psychological warfare of RFE in the proper light, by Report No. 8, of December 31, 1954. "Especially the proclamation of the Košice Program, of April 5, 1945," the Report states on page 17, "opened the door for an unobstructed drive on the part of the Communists to seize full power in the country."

Policy of Appeasement

Let the readers draw their conclusions as they see fit. There is no better way to expose the intrinsic bankruptcy of Radio Free Europe's policy. It is not the fight against communism which these psychological warriors carry on; they stand for appeasement and reconciliation.

Thus, of all people, Konni Zilliacus, the left wing British Laborite who has for years been a faithful contributor to publications of the Communist party, was invited by Radio Free Europe to address the Czechoslovak people. This is what Zilliacus, in broken Czech, beamed over the

air waves to the trans-Curtain slaves, on April 17, 1953, at 12:40 p. m.: "You would enormously encourage and strengthen those in the West who, for the sake of reconciliation, would like to meet the Soviet Union and the people's democracies half way if you were to rehabilitate those of the Prague trial who are still in prison, and clear the memory of those who died or were killed..."

Zilliacus here did not refer to any anti-Communist victims. He spoke of such Communists as the Secretary General of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, Slansky-Salzmann, who had been subjected to one of the interminable purge trials and put to death by his coreligionist, Štefan Rajs, then Communist Minister of Justice. Not anti-Communists, but the arch-Communist Slansky-Salzmann and his confederates were to be "rehabilitated" for the sake of "reconciliation" with the Communists. That is the sort of psychological warfare RFE has been propagating.

In similar vein, Milos Vanek, old champion of Red causes, said on April 12, 1953, at 3:05 p. m.: "...as long as the Soviet Union fails to prove by deeds that she is in earnest in her alleged desire to put an end to the cold war and the hot war, she cannot expect that we may diminish our efforts to liberate all the oppressed peoples."

One week later, on the same "Round Table Discussion" program, again at 3:05 p. m., Vanek said: "First let the Communists make peace with their own people. They ought to resort to peaceful means in their internal policy, too."

We might as well ask wolves to stop devouring lambs, and hyenas to turn into doves of peace. It is nothing less than RFE's Zilliacus and Vanek expect.

It is therefore no exaggeration to state that Radio Free Europe has consistently addressed its broadcasts not to anti-Communists, but to Communists, Titoists, semi-Communists and pro-Communist Socialists behind the Iron Curtain. This fatal policy has spread apathy among what is left of genuine anti-Communists beyond the Curtain. This is not the inspiring fight for freedom; it is the deadly appeasement of the Communist tyranny.

Inasmuch as Radio Free Europe is controlled and staffed by socialists, pro-Communists, World Federalists

and other assorted internationalists, we should not be surprised to learn that ineffective and harmful programs, and even broadcasts amounting to sabotage, have characterized its specific policies. Particularly noteworthy features comprise:

1. The repetition of banalities—"truth-telling."
2. The "People's Program."
3. Attacks on petty Communists and protection of Communist bosses.
4. Defense of American pro-Communist errors.
5. Broadcasts amounting to sabotage.
6. The spreading of recognizable and destructive lies.
7. Failure to propagate German-Czech and German-Polish reconciliation.
8. Occasional advice to follow Communist suggestions.
9. Leninist incitement to premature revolts.
10. Propagation of decadent literature and music.
11. Propagation of internationalism and racial merger.
12. Praise for the New Dealers, and criticism of conservative Americans.

Repetition of Banalities

For many a year, a disproportionate amount of broadcast time, be it out of ineptness or actually malicious intent, has been allotted by Radio Free Europe to the never-ending reiteration of banalities. We might identify this curious practice as RFE's special little game of "telling the truth." it goes somewhat like this:

- the Communists call Americans imperialists; Americans are not imperialists.
- the Communists claim that they want peace; Communists don't want peace.
- the Communists claim that the American economy is bad; the American economy is good.

Of what avail is the production of such trivialities? Can there be any doubt that the endless repetition of such trite assertions spreads boredom and turns away potential listeners? If at least RFE's broadcasters made a sustained effort to explain why Americans are not imperialists, and why their economy excels that of the collectivists, listeners

might be inspired to do some constructive thinking. The nature of RFE's script writers and editors, of course, forbids any such sensible procedure; for collectivists cannot be expected to expose the impotence of collectivism.

In a certain way, RFE prides itself on being "specific" in the stale little game of "telling the truth." As an example, the reporter of a broadcast delivered on May 3rd, 1953, at 8:45 a. m., stated: "In Hungary there are obvious supply deficiencies... Canned food has gone bad... There is a lack of sugar in Bulgaria... Poland suffers from a shortage of fish..." This sort of news, of course, is no news behind the Iron Curtain. If the economic failure of the Soviet realm were explained as the inevitable result of state intervention, listeners might find it proper to heed such programs.

Another part of the quaint little truth-telling game consists of reporting concrete conditions and happenings from the world of the slave labor camps. Inasmuch as there cannot be any suggestion regarding the termination of these horrors, the effect of these reports is exactly what the Communist leaders desire, i. e., to lame the will of the people by striking terror into their hearts.

Until May 1, 1954, this sort of aimless and uncoordinated "truth-telling" seemed to be RFE's principal task. Then—at last—a definite over-all program was announced. Does this mean liberation? Let us look and see.

The "Program of the People's Opposition," proposed on Labor Day, 1954, at 10:10 a. m., and frequently reiterated and referred to ever since, contained the following ten postulates:

1. Labor unions should belong to their members, not the bosses. The positions of union officials should be elective.
2. There should be less talk and more hard cash. Honest money (sic!) for honest work.
3. The worker should be permitted to choose the type of work he prefers.
4. Overtime should be outlawed.
5. Peasants should be allowed to quit the kolkhozes (i.e., collectives) if they so desire.

6. There should be a ceiling on the state's share of agricultural production. Farm contributions to the state should be equalized.
7. The government should work for the people, not the politicians.
8. Production should benefit the people, not the state.
9. Emphasis should once more be on the consumer. Small shops, owned and run by little people, should be revived, to serve the consumer.
10. The building industry should be mobilized for the benefit of the people, instead of the state officials.

Some points of this so-called people's program, at first sight, may look impressive. Its cardinal and decisive error derives precisely from the inability of its collectivistic perpetrators to recognize the primacy of the enterprise. This program fails to go to the root of the matter. It does not attack state control as such. It merely proposes to mitigate and qualify. It is at its core plain socialism. Yet this is the sort of thing which, in the form of leaflets, is dropped from the trans-Curtain skies by means of the "freedom balloons" which columnists like Drew Pearson have been vaunting for years.

This program does not offer any decisive opposition to the tyranny of nationalization as such. There is but the indecisive and dull suggestion to reform the present Communist system, to abolish its excesses, to turn it into some form of Titoism or semi-communism or to return to the socialism of the bankrupt National Front.

Instinctively, the Czechs and Slovaks who hear this so-called people's program reach for the knob and shut it off. They must shrug their shoulders at the oratorical antics of men who rant against talking but in their own turn offer little beyond empty talk.

This "Program of the People's Opposition" is faulty and spurious because the concept of Radio Free Europe is based on a capital error. Radio Free Europe basically maintains that the threat to the free world comes from Russia as an armed and aggressive power; it obfuscates the fundamental issue of the world-wide Communist conspiracy.

In accordance with this leftist line, Radio Free Europe

absolutely never refers to congressional investigations of subversives in the United States. Trans-Curtain listeners are completely unaware of the existence of such men as Jenner, Velde, Eastland, Walter, Dies, Reece, and Mundt. When the Kersten committee operated in Munich, in the summer of 1954, RFE referred to it; but the texts of testimonies were edited to suit the over-all soft-pedaling of basic issues. Radio Free Europe acts as if it were set up to preserve the concept of state bureaucracy and paternalism by all available means.

Petty Communists Blamed for Party Policy

Radio Free Europe acts as the quack who peddles cure-alls for the most nauseating aspects of the Communist disease; it fails to tackle the roots of communism as such. Thus it makes much ado about the chicaneries and perversions of petty Communist officials, but it does not name the real culprits, the wire-pullers, the bosses who guide and encourage the brutalities of little village tyrants.

Radio Free Europe refers by name to individual Stakhanovites, tractor-drivers, and prison-guards; it disregards the organizers of the hated Communist drives. It thus actually protects the pillars of the Communist society, the calculating masterminds who play on the weaknesses of a confused citizenry and trap their helpless victims in a net of Communist demoralization and perversion.

In "Messages to Those at Home," Radio Free Europe pillories the little informers who are known to work for the state police. Almost without exception these little fellows are known far and wide as stooges of the Communist masters. Dossiers on these puppets do not add to the knowledge about Communist evil-doers. These dossiers are largely based on clippings from the press of Communist-controlled eastern Europe. The secret agents of the Soviet police, the directors of the program of terror, are never mentioned.

"Messages to Those at Home," on February 29, 1952, at 7:45 p. m., as an example, said: "Who is the master in Nitra? (A tiny Slovak town — Editor.) Who is the master of whom the Soviet police itself is in fear? It is Sergeant Klike. He is hated, dreaded and mighty. He causes the pun-

ishment of policemen who sometimes have a heart for their victims."

Now, who is this monster, Sergeant Klike? Not any "master" by any means. He is but well-known little sergeant of the uniformed police!

Again, on June 26, 1952, at 12:15 p. m., "Messages to Those at Home" singled out a few Communist women: "Comrades M. Pokorelska, H. Yanosikova, Kr. Bezakova and M. Dedinkova," the broadcast addressed itself to these petty Communists, "swine-herds and tractor-drivers, remember in time the warnings of today. Tomorrow you may be brought to account for your misdeeds; but tomorrow may be too late for you."

"Program for Civil and State Servants," on April 10, 1955, at 8:40 a. m., importantly sounded off: "We call your attention to a dangerous informer. The pensioner Michalek, Kulda Street, Brno, persecutes beggars. He chases them from homes and often hands them over to the police. In your own interest, Comrade Michalek, we advise you to stop your dirty work."

This sort of broadcasting, declaimed in a lowered, almost comical tone, is supposed to scare primitive swine-herds and tractor-drivers. The bosses are never named.

Radio Free Europe never criticizes the mistakes or the treason of the past and thus never has to explain the real reasons of the Communist successes in the past. In the same way as they conceal systematically all real causes of the communization of Czechoslovakia, they conceal also the real causes of Communist advances in other part of the world.

Let sleeping dogs lie—that seems to be RFE's guiding inspiration. There is no criticism of Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. These conferences, in line with the views of an Alger Hiss, are regarded as just splendid. If only the bad men of the Kremlin had not betrayed their solemn pledges!

"We Teach History," on February 13, 1952, at 6:15 p. m., stated: "The Soviet Union broke the Yalta agreement and betrayed it... The ink on the document had hardly dried when the Soviet Union made a display of violation and unparalleled cynicism."

"Sunday Comments of Ferdinand Peroutka," on April

3, 1955, at 12:15 p.m., commented: "When the Yalta papers were published, some individuals wanted to reprimand the Democratic leaders for lack of cautiousness. But any discussion of some little mistakes the Democratic leaders may have made would merely obscure the principal wrong, which has been and remains the systematic deception contrived by the Russian statesmen. These realities ought to be clearly understood by the world. The Yalta conference turned into a tragedy, not because of what was agreed upon there, but because the Soviet Union failed to honor the agreements."

Broadcasts Amounting to Sabotage

Naturally, if we are deceived regarding our own stupidity, and even betrayal, at Yalta, we are likely to remain unaware of the stupidity and perhaps even sabotage which have characterized a certain type of RFE's refugee programs. Incredible though it may seem, Radio Free Europe—against the persistent pleas and protests of refugees from behind the Iron Curtain—in its Saturday programs has offered detailed descriptions of successful flights from the Soviet terror. These broadcasts have named the locations where the border was passed, and indicated even the persons who, at the risk of their lives, assisted the escapees.

There could not have been any better means to alert the Communist police. The very identities of patriots in eastern Europe were thus disclosed to the Soviet secret police, with the result that any recurrence might be prevented. How self-destructive, at the expense of optimistic American donors, can we get? Were the script writers and editors of these "sensational" programs really so naive that they failed to grasp the sinister consequences of their paradoxical role? Did they really not understand that their disclosures about the specific locations of escape would enable the Communist police to plug the last holes in the Curtain?

Let us quote from the broadcast, "I Chose Freedom," of April 25, 1953, 8:30 a. m. "I went through Cerna Hora," the refugee interviewee revealed, "walking along the highway. Then I went back to the river bed of Vltava, in

the direction of the Austrian Soviet zone. I approached the Jezuv creek . . . across from it there is forbidden territory. . . . In Frynburg there is a bridge across the river, and the road to Vyssi Brod. In St. Thomas there is the headquarters of the patrols. The bridge had been torn down. I made a float from an old fence and other wood I gathered. The river is about ten meters wide and three meters deep at that spot. (This was said in reply to a question from the broadcaster. — Editor.) I guided the float by means of a pole, and then set foot on the forbidden side. I hid in the bushes and woods . . . On the highway to St. Thomas I encountered a barbed wire barricade, about three feet high. I found an old ladder in a hut which had been empty ever since the German's left. I broke it in two, put it against the barricade, climbed, and jumped to the other side. Traversing a distance of about thirty meters, I reached Jezuv creek, which is less than a meter wide. I crossed the creek and found myself in the Soviet zone of Austria.

"In Austria, I followed the highway until I entered a little house below a hill. The Austrians who occupied this house felt pity for the refugee, and assisted me. They helped me to contact a friend of theirs in Linz who was to get me safely across a bridge in Linz, on the border of the Soviet and American zones. That man provided me with a forged identification card, into which we rubbed some dirt in order to make the name illegible. I joined a group of girls who passed the sentry at that spot. Nonchalantly, I produced the forged identity card for the sentry, and without looking back I crossed the bridge. I was in the Western zone of Austria."

Enemy Alerted

The Communist enemy could not have been more brazenly alerted. Letters of protest against such asinine (if not treacherous) interviews flooded the expellee press in Munich. Nevertheless, the interviews continued until 1954, by which time a great many of the cracks in the Soviet wall had been revealed to the Russians, and repaired by them.

As late as May 9, 1954, at 3:45 p. m., the "I Chose Freedom" broadcast disclosed the exact details of a flight

by express train from Decin, Bohemia, to Berlin. The interviewee described how he had concealed his presence at the Decin railway station, how he eluded the attention of the security agents, and how a "people's policeman" at the station in East Berlin helped him to escape.

As late as April 2, 1955, at 12:45 p. m., again on the "I Chose Freedom" program, an escapee pictured the details of his flight across the above-mentioned bridge in Linz.

Can there be any doubt that such interviews intimidate those behind the Iron Curtain who might be willing to cooperate with refugees? Can our friends behind the Iron Curtain maintain even a shred of confidence in "psychological warriors" who indulge in this sort of give-away?

The editor of RFE's "I Chose Freedom," one Otto Graf, had been editor of the Socialist paper **Svet Práce** and a well-known Communist collaborator of the National Front. An obscure journalist before War II, he owes his career to his fatal activities in the National Front.

Zdenek Fierlinger and Bohumil Lausman, Socialist ministers of the National Front, were the publishers of **Svet Práce**, at the time of Graf's editorship. In 1948, on the occasion of the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia, Fierlinger turned out to be a Communist planted in the Social Democratic party. Lausman, after his "escape" to the free world, in 1951 worked for a while for Radio Free Europe. Afterwards, he turned out to be a Communist agent and returned to Czechoslovakia. As editor of the Czechoslovak refugee paper, **Československé Noviny**, in Ludwigsburg, Germany, RFE editor Otto Graf published articles by Lausman.

Self-destructive Lies Broadcast

It is hard to believe that a man who has been able to function as a newspaper editor is so inept that quite a few of his presumably anti-Communist radio programs in effect equal sabotage of the freedom crusade. That a saboteur of the free world's cause could hardly improve on these refugee programs is evident from their text.

An almost equally self-destructive feature of Radio Free Europe is the routine broadcasting of transparent lies.

In a number of pamphlets, including *The RFE Story* (p. 14), RFE's psychological warriors proudly admit resorting to lies. Whether lies should be part of our "psycho war" program is both ethically and practically quite debatable. To brag about one's own lie in print, so that their admission may be quoted by the enemy, once again reaches that degree of ingenuousness that in its net results is hardly distinguishable from sabotage.

In addition to all that, many of the fabrications which our RFE brain trusters have thought up are such simple inventions that those for whom they are intended immediately recognize them as such.

For example, Otto Graf and Vladimir Kucera-Hornik, at Christmas, 1954, when making programs on the miner's life, made a report about a great coal mine catastrophe in Kladno, which allegedly cost twelve lives of miners. This report was invented.

We may be sure that a character like Bohumil Lausman, former chairman of the Czechoslovak Social Democratic party and afterwards a plain Communist agent in Western Germany and Austria, fed RFE such damaging stories, and that some editors believed him. Yet who but one-time National Front collaborators — RFE's favorites — would put any trust in Lausman anyhow? RFE has made it easy for the Communist to prove RFE's own mendacity. Verbatim quotations from RFE's press and radio are all that is required.

There is still another lie, even more destructive, which has been produced by the "truth-telling" of Radio Free Europe.

It is the number one lie, and concerns the core of the Communist system.

There is irrefutable evidence regarding which group is making communism in the East. This evidence comes from refugees from the East and from various reliable sources. This group is characterized by such names as Kruglow (or Krugloch), the chief of the Secret Police of the USSR, Kaganovic, Ehrenburg, Berman, Rakosi-Rosenkranz, etc. In addition, this group fully and completely constitutes that "invisible government" behind the scenes in

the East. It is the same group, of course, which also makes the Communist conspiracy in the West.

When in 1951 the members of this group (Minister of Justice Stefan Rais, etc.) staged purge trials against other members of the same group — Slansky-Salzmänn, Reicin, Katz, etc. — RFE shouted to the world that the entire group was being cruelly persecuted and liquidated in the East. Many samples of such programs are available.

This greatest and most perverted lie of world communism is being upheld by RFE even now, and all facts contradicting it are cut, adjusted or suppressed. Every intelligent refugee from the East calls this lie the number one sabotage committed by RFE.

An intelligent investigation of RFE as well as of the opinions and the material of the refugees from behind the Iron Curtain would easily bring forth the full truth.

Former German Co-Citizens Alienated

It is not enough to quote Radio Free Europe to expose its socialist and internationalist bias. To point out lost opportunities as well as deliberate omissions permits us to penetrate the confused and half-hearted mentality of this much-touted and expensive outfit. Perhaps the best example of RFE's negativism toward important objectives of the free world is its peculiar attitude towards the Germans. To be sure, on the surface the West German Republic and Chancellor Adenauer have been officially praised by RFE. Beyond such formalities, RFE has done little to inspire the Czechs and Poles with trust in the Germans.

In 1945, the Communists forced the Poles and the Czechs to expel close to fifteen million Germans from their homeland of centuries. About three million of these lost their lives as they walked through the Iron Ore Mountains, the Sudeten Mountains and the Bohemian Forest or as they were shipped westward in cattle cars which somewhere were left on the tracks. All of the other twelve million were robbed of their property. Most of them were beaten and tortured.

Naturally, the Czechs and the Poles fear the vengeance of their former German co-citizens. Understandably,

the Communists do all they can to keep this fear alive among the Poles and the Czechs who are under their domination.

It would be the duty of Radio Free Europe to counteract this Communist policy by telling the Poles and Czechs about the numerous manifestations of good will and the sincere desire for reconciliation on the part of displaced Germans living in Western Germany. Radio Free Europe does nothing of the sort. It does not even report the official agreements which expelled Czech statesmen have signed with the German expellees.

In summary, RFE's stand on the highly important expellee problem is as follows:

- a. It does not even mention the peaceful attitude and program of the German expellees.
- b. It ridicules exiled Czechs and Poles who do not hate the Germans.
- c. It fails ever to refer to the remarkable past achievements of the Germans in Czechoslovakia and to examples of German-Czech cooperation.
- d. It never mentions how the expulsion of the anti-Communist Germans enabled the communization of Czechoslovakia from within.
- e. It continually harps on the persecutions the Czechs and Poles have suffered under German domination.
- f. It damns the Germans with faint praise, and slyly, in veiled fashion, even incites the Slavs against the Germans.
- g. By upholding the expulsion of fifteen million Germans and defending the Oder-Neisse border, it follows a line of nationality policy which is identical with that of the Communists.

Advice to Fellow Communist Suggestions

There are many other — apparently often harmless — occasions on which RFE's line coincides with what the Communists desire. Why men should be paid by Americans to broadcast from expensive stations what our Communist enemies want in the first place is not easy to grasp.

Particularly baffling examples of American-Soviet co-

incidences have come from the desk of Milos Vanek, chief of the Economic Department of the Czechoslovak Desk, RFE, Munich. Formerly one of the most prominent leaders of the Czech Communist party, Vanek still feels urged to counsel Czechs in harmony with his former confederates.

Early in 1952, Vanek busied himself forecasting an immediate inflation, and advising the people to invest their cash in goods, including the expensive products of the Communist gray market. Innumerable programs have carried this message to the Czechs.

The broadcast of January 23, 1952, at 6:45 p. m., admonished the Czechs: "The Communists in Czechoslovakia are about to unloose inflation. Invest all your savings in goods, buy whatever you can, even the expensive articles on the government market."

There was no inflation; but the refugees from the satellite country reported that the Communist government at that time spread exactly the same rumor of inflation and also advised to spend all savings because it wanted to draw in all "surplus" money without any monetary reform.

A year and a half later, when, of a sudden, the new value of the Czech currency was announced, neither the Communists in Czechoslovakia nor Vanek in RFE had given any warning.

When the Communist government asked for shock brigades of volunteers to plant new forests, Vanek enthusiastically chimed in. "Help to plant new trees," Vanek exhorted the Czechs on the "Economic Program" of May 1, 1953. "The Communist regime," he announced, "will perish, and the trees will be for your children."

Other programs have offered similar advice. "Program for Women," October 24, 1953, at 1:45 p. m., counseled to sell quality goods to Communist state stores "because the Communist stores are selling the goods to non-Communists, and it is not good to cheat non-Communists."

"Program for Workers," March 23, 1955, 2:10 p. m., suggested that workers ask foremen for extra work because it would mean extra money for them while it would not really help the Communist cause.

Along the same line, the old collaborator, Otto Graf,

interviewed a fellow by name of Tonda Hornik, who said: "I thus earned 2,000 crowns extra—it pays not to be lazy." Radio Free Europe, thus, does not urge the satellite slave workers to relax if not slow down, it spurs them on to work harder—for their Communist masters. Those in the know were not surprised when "worker" Tonda Hornik, in June, 1955, was exposed as a Communist agent.

One of RFE's editors, Robert Loukota by name, had gone to the extreme of appealing to the Czech workers not to absent themselves from work; but the protests from refugees who had listened to this monstrosity were so impressive that RFE had to back down and, in a broadcast of April 10, 1955, at 12:45 p. m. ("We Call the Communist Party"), tried to minimize the importance of Loukota's aberration.

Do these editors who urge the Czech people to follow such advice have a soft spot in their hearts for the Communists—or are they following the orders of men whose hearts and minds are hard as steel?

On the one hand, Radio Free Europe has urged Czechs to do overtime in factories giving only evasive consolations, never mentioning how and when liberation could be achieved; on the other, through provocative agitation, it has practically incited them to revolt. Such policy, on the surface, appears contradictory. On second thought, we might wonder if all of this confusion is due to ineptness.

As long as the Western governments are not prepared to supply potential rebels with weapons, no rebellion can succeed. Only people who are unacquainted with the nature of communism can hope to overthrow Communist governments without outside assistance.

Certainly the present United States government is not inclined to arm potential insurrectionists. Even if it wanted to, a horde of United Nations associates would prevent it from going ahead. Why then does Radio Free Europe fail to warn resolutely against revolts at this time?

Curiously enough, Lenin favored armed uprisings—against his own regime; for nothing exposes more glaringly the staunchest freedom fighters, and nothing offers a more striking opportunity to exterminate the most stout-hearted

foes of communism. Whatever the reason may be — and it appears most worthwhile to get to the bottom of the situation — Radio Free Europe again and again has played the role of the agent provocateur. Whether or not any sabotage was intended, the policy has actually been of benefit to the Communists.

First of all, RFE has pictured the enemy as weak while in reality he is strong.

"Life Behind the Iron Curtain," on April 26, 1953, at 8:45 a. m., exclaimed: "There is chaos, uncertainty and fear in the Soviet Union and among its leaders."

"Best Article," on April 24, 1953, at 9:05 a. m., stated that "there are rifts within the system," and on April 17 it claimed that "we face the beginning of a dissolution process which affects the entire regime."

Few Americans know that the broadcast of RIAS, the American broadcasting station in Berlin, shared in the responsibility for the tragic 1953 rebellion of the Germans in the Soviet zone — a rebellion which led to the arrest and annihilation of tens of thousands of our best friends behind the Iron Curtain. Practically no American knows that RFE has sent the same sort of abortive action programs to the Czechs.

On February 8, 1952, at 9:15 p. m., Milos Vanek, on "Economic Program," approvingly spoke of the rise of "armed brigades against their leaders in the Communist party itself." Hopefully he observed that "the signs . . . are already on the horizon."

When in Czechoslovakia public demonstrations took place in 1953, Radio Free Europe pictured them in inflammatory scenes. The other programs reflected the same attitudes.

On June 21, 1953, at 12:15 p. m., the perennial "Sunday Comments of Ferdinand Peroutka," referring to the tragic and fatal uprising among the Germans, told the Czechs: "Do you know that tens of thousands of workers there are on the march, shouting 'Ivan, go home? Do you know that everybody there is fed up with the Soviet overlordship, has enough of Soviet exploitation?'"

Again and again, Peroutka has dicussed premature — and therefore suicidal — uprisings in an inflammatory fashion. For the sake of preserving precious friends for a more opportune time, we might well have followed the advice of the late Senator Robert A. Taft, who vigorously opposed such heedlessness.

Propagation of Decadent Literature and Music

For the time being, Radio Free Europe might well content itself with building up the morale of those who long for liberation from the Communist tyrants. There are numerous straightforward books which take a courageous stand against any and all undue control by government. These, though, are not the books from which RFE's commentators have chosen to quote. No, the cultural fare which they have selected is largely confined to decadence in literature, and jazz in the realm of music.

The program "Play of the Week" is full of mental confusion and decay. The books which are reviewed and quoted, and which are supposed to represent the world of the free, abound in decadent characters, in suicide and perversion. As to literature which is supposed to represent eastern Europe, the emphasis is strongly placed on works of defected collectivists, picturing the horror and the hopelessness among the satellite nations.

The editor of "Book of the Week," on August 3, 1952, at 9:45 a. m., expounded: "We enable you to become acquainted with the literature which is current in the free world. Take a book by Mannus Ferber, who once was a Communist . . . the story in itself is colorless — a tera in the ocean . . . there are no ready answers anywhere . . ."

On April 26, 1953, at 9:45 a. m., "Book of the Week" to present another typical example — discussed *The Polish Mill*, by Jean Giodo: "A mysterious curse rests on the family," the commentator explained. "In vain, Kosta opposes the weight of destiny . . . his son-in-law becomes mentally insane . . . his daughter goes crazy . . . the young woman is slowly dying . . . the power of fate is the core of the book . . . all revolt against it is futile . . ."

"Weekly Survey of Culture," of January 4, 1953, at 11:15 a. m., told of a work of literature that is "full of complexes and inner conflicts . . ."

"Film Program," of April 9, 1955, at 2:20 p. m., reviewed a film directed by Eliza Kazan: " . . . he went to see his mother in the brothel . . . he borrowed money from her, even though he despises her, and then he made a good business deal . . . a drama full of instincts, passions, and convulsions, of undertones . . . a master work by Kazan . . ."

This story about a moral and strong father whose wife lives in a brothel was offered by RFE during the Easter holidays.

RFE seems to be chockful of split personalities, of people with complexes, of those who are in need of psychiatrists, of people whom we might pity if there were not so little time left and if they were not entrusted with the task of championing our principles of trust in God and our responsibilities as free men.

The music offered by RFE, at 10:05 every morning, and at other hours, accords with the confusion, savagery and hopelessness of the literary products which these men favor. Most of it is jazz in the version of the squeaking disharmonies and noises of primitives, or of complex men who flee from their own souls. The West is rich in music of the highest inspiration. RFE seems not aware of this mighty force in our behalf.

The Communist station in Prague does better. The Communists, mindful of national heritage, play Smetana and Dvorak, the great music of the Czech people. They benefit by these magnificent works. But Radio Free Europe broadcasts jazz — alien, uninspiring stuff. Some of the less influential employees on Radio Free Europe have protested against these low and degrading performances. They were told from above to go on producing jazz.

Propagation of Internationalism and Racial Merger

The general mental and moral climate of Radio Free Europe conveys moods of indecision, wretchedness and vexation.

Inherently most of the ideals which RFE advocates require some sort of super-government, which means but additional curtailment of the liberties which this costly radio network is supposed to champion. On nearly every day, for instance, there is a program which urges the abolition of naturally-grown national culture in favor of the European super-state. It is called "Europe Without the Iron Curtain" and it always begins with the slogan: "Europe without the Iron Curtain means the United States of Europe. Yesterday but Utopia, today the dream of millions, tomorrow reality." The slogan has been formulated by the widely known internationalist Karol Belak-Berger.

Paradoxically, the Communist internationalists in the East are smart enough to appeal often to age-old, traditional nationalism. Radio Free Europe, which has been presumably conceived to fight Communist internationalism, champions internationalism.

"Nearly all Czechs and Slovaks desire the United States of Europe." That is what "The Other Side of the Coin" asserted, on April 5, 1955, at 8:15 a. m. A free poll or plebiscite among the enslaved Czechs and Slovaks might well disclose a different mood, a different opinion.

On June 6, 1952, at 7:15 p. m., "Europe Without the Iron Curtain" stated: "The world federation is a necessity; but first Europe must be united. The European federation is but the beginning; the United States of the World is the ultimate aim . . . First a European federation must be achieved; then we shall be ready for the world federation."

In accordance with this candidly avowed goal, RFE continually disparages the concept of national sovereignty, which is dear to the overwhelming majority of Europeans. Thus "Comments on Events at Home," on April 28, 1953, at 10:45 a. m., slightly referred to "the so-called national sovereignty."

"Europe Without the Iron Curtain," on May 5, 1954, at 1:15 p. m., stated: "On the defendant's bank there sits the concept of the national state and its ideological foundation — nationalism. Frontiers — the straitjacket of the national state — are an anachronism."

The United Nations and UNESCO — a controversial topic among millions of Europeans — are favorites of RFE. "The United Nations gives new hope," said "News," on October 24, 1953, at 1 p. m. "The whole world looks toward the United Nations," said "Who Is Who," on April 22, 1953, at 8:30 a. m. Such statements are daily standard with Radio Free Europe.

Ever opposed to nationalism, RFE even objects to national self-determination of the many non-Russian nations inside the Soviet empire. It stands to reason that national self-assertion inside Russia might be a powerful aid to any effort aimed at disintegration of the Soviet Union. Consequently this is opposed by RFE's amazing bleeding hearts. Thus, "Voices of the Western Press," on February 8, 1952, at 8 p. m., quoted: "Russia should not dissolve herself into a number of smaller nations; the nations of the Soviet Union should discontinue their disputes."

In its determined opposition to the concept of national heritage, and in harmony with the ideas favored by such American left-wing groups as Americans for Democratic Action, RFE, in programs addressed to the trans-Curtain people, goes so far as to attack the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. Thus, "Our New York Correspondent Reports," on April 29, 1953, at 10:05 a. m., declared: "The public wants the law to be changed; for the nationality quotas of this law are obsolete . . . The press unanimously demands revision. We hope that the change will be effected."

Beyond mere political merger of the nations, Radio Free Europe also campaigns for a merger of races. Thus, for instance, "Europe Without the Iron Curtain," on February 15, 1952, at 6:15 p. m., declared: "Just as Europe, in a way, already represents a nation . . . there also arises a new nation in the U. S. A. — out of the white, the black, and the yellow races . . . This too will happen in the East of Europe."

Along this line, RFE's left-wingers seldom fail to disguise their animosity towards those nations which they regard as particularly nationalistic — against the past Germany, Spain, the Union of South Africa, and the various

Arab nations. RFE's persistent opposition to the Arab states sometimes reaches comical proportions. An article in itself would be required to document this phase of RFE's internationalism.

Praise for New Dealers and Criticism of Conservative Americans

In line with its over-all outlook, Radio Free Europe has consistently glorified American New Dealers and has at the same time not refrained from merciless attacks on conservative Americans. In other words, RFE, which should concentrate on psychological warfare against the Communist world conspiracy, has indulged in the hobby of defaming valiant American anti-Communists. No wonder that wide-awake Europeans have ever more often asked if RFE is primarily an anti-anti-Communist organization.

"Answers to Those at Home," on October 28, 1952, at 10:05 a. m., proclaimed: "Stevenson was a principal speaker at the celebration for T. G. Masaryk. (Founder and first president of the Czechoslovak republic. — Editor.) Our hope for the future would be rekindled if he were elected President of the United States."

On November 4, 1952, at 10:05 a. m., the same program reveled in this choice bit of lyrical effusion: "Adlai Stevenson . . . ranks among America's greatest sons, such as Lincoln and F. D. Roosevelt . . . He is the very incarnation of America's highest aspirations . . . Within less than a year he rose from obscurity to the pinnacle of American leadership."

The record of Radio Free Europe's programs is full of unfavorable remarks about those great Americans who have steadfastly opposed the Communist menace. A flood of vituperation was poured on General Douglas MacArthur upon his dismissal from the Far Eastern scene. His speeches, which have moved the truly anti-Communist refugees from eastern Europe, have been consistently withheld from RFE's programs.

It was the same with the great and honorable Senator Robert A. Taft, on the occasion of his campaign for the Republican nomination in 1952. After "Mr. Republican's"

defeat at the Chicago Convention, "Our New York Correspondent Reports," on August 7, 1952, at 10:05 a. m., rejoiced: "For Europe it is decisive that the last remainders of isolationism have been removed, and that a sound policy has been carried to victory."

Ferdinand Peroutka, in one of his interminable "Sunday Comments," on August 3, 1952, at 12:15 p. m., pontificated: "Taft was the proponent of a policy which can never settle anything, as his adversaries have always pointed out."

"Our New York Correspondent Reports," on July 9, 1952, at 8:05 p. m., had this to say: "The opinions of (Herbert) Hoover and (Douglas) MacArthur represent the viewpoint of a minority; these men want to confine themselves to the (exclusive) defense of the American continent. The majority (of Americans), though, have dismissed this attitude and are conscious of America's global role."

"A Program of Novelties," referring to the passing of two famous American journalists — Pulitzer and Bert McCormick — on April 3, 1955, at 3 p. m., called Pulitzer the "son of an Hungarian immigrant, an outstanding American journalist," but criticized Colonel McCormick as a "controversial, reactionary isolationist" who "opposed progress." The Kremlin must have been satisfied with that incisive observation.

General Impression Created By Radio Free Europe

What, then, is the general impression which Radio Free Europe has made, behind the Iron Curtain as well as among the millions of anti-Communists in Western Europe? It is, besides the impression of half-heartedness, indecision, artificiality, and downright clowning.

When RFE's broadcasters, directly addressing some poor wretch or some swineherd in some forlorn little hamlet in Slovakia or Bohemia, lower their voices to terrify him, anti-Communist refugees merely laugh. Alas, the farce tastes bitter, because of the lost opportunities, the stupidity, the feeling of treason, and the unsonscionably low moral standard.

Next, there is the strong impression of cliché journalism, occupying itself with superficialities — cars, houses,

etc. — and largely avoiding verbatim quotations. Instead, they impose their propaganda by means of slogans.

Real opinions of the refugees and of the people at home are disregarded by the RFE propaganda. Real anti-Communists are never allowed to get their messages across the Curtain. Real anti-Communists, including the repenting National Fronters, are social outcasts. But the collaborators of the National Front, who even today maintain that the National Front was all right, sit at the big desks and cash their substantial checks, in compensation for their shadow boxing.

Then there is the distinct impression of coolness, impersonality and anonymity. Since the well-known anti-Communists of long standing have been barred from RFE, there are no names to inspire the listeners. Yes, some men do speak under their own names. These include the left-winger Dr. Joseph Lettrich, the Marxist Vaclav Majer, and such Socialists as Ferdinand Peroutka, Dr. Petr Zenkl and Dr. Jaroslav Stransky. However, these men are known to be weaklings, mere fronts for more powerful personalities. They are recognized to be generally useless; they won't stir the imagination of anyone.

As to the known former champions of the Communist causes, trans-Curtain listeners would simply shut off the radio if they knew who was talking to them. Therefore, Milos Vanek now calls himself Pravdomil Basta, and Frantisek Listopad goes by the name of Jan Ctvrttek. Similarly, the leftist Socialist Dr. Miloslav Kohak has become Vitezslav Fram; Otto Graf hides his pro-Communist past under the pseudonym of Franta Tabor, and Karol Belak-Berger has conveniently turned into one Jan Lehota. "Who are these fellows anyhow?" the listeners behind the Curtain must wonder; for they have never heard of them. Naturally, they become suspicious, and their interest sags.

Czechs and Slovaks behind the Curtain remember those who never compromised with the Communists. They know that these men are now living in the West — the Czechoslovak General of the Army, Lev Prchala, the former Czechoslovak Minister, Dr. Joseph Cerny, and many others, and

also some former members of the National Front who in the free West started to denounce it — Dr. Bohdan Chudoba, Dr. Michal Zibrin, or Dr. Helena Koželuhova, who was expelled in 1946 from the Parliament by the National Front, and the entire younger generation, led by Jiri Havelka, Emil Petrik, etc. The Slovaks have their former Minister, Dr. Ferdinand Durcansky and many others. The listeners behind the Iron Curtain cannot fail to wonder why none of them sends any “messages home” by way of Radio Free Europe.

The masterminds of this confusion, whose net results represent sabotage of the anti-Communist fight — are way behind the firing lines in New York City, and in Washington. They, too, shroud themselves in anonymity.

The over-all impression, then, is one of cynicism and emptiness, artificiality, and insincerity. Who wants to buy apples which are rotten at the core?

RFE's Program

In conclusion, we must ask: What, then, is the program of Radio Free Europe, or has no program been designed so far?

Those behind the Curtain, who have the time to listen at all, would like to know in what way liberation may be achieved, and what specific assistance, beyond mere words, the West might be able to offer. Radio Free Europe has not been able to supply any satisfactory information in respect to this all-important problem.

Here, however, we cannot help allowing for valid reasons to excuse much of RFE's ineffectualness; for even if RFE were staffed with outright, hard-hitting anti-Communists, it could not possibly make any promises which the Western governments, particularly the government of the U. S. A., were not willing to back with power.

There is no use in claiming superiority in aircraft or guided missiles if that superiority admittedly does not exist. It is not possible to promise an economic blockade as long as that policy has not been adopted by the American government. Radio Free Europe — or any of the other liberation

stations — cannot very well offer the severing of diplomatic relations with the Soviet criminals when our own statesmen meet with them at the summit and have lots of smiling pictures taken for the benefit of the Soviet leaders.

However, if RFE were really (instead of merely in name) an independent and private organization, and really staffed with intelligent and genuine anti-Communists, it could urge Western governments to take stronger steps.

Radio Free Europe might demand the creation of military units exclusively composed of refugee and expellee volunteers. It might demand the ousting of Communists from both international and national organizations. It might establish extensive contacts with the underground behind the Curtain, instead of causing its discovery and extermination by Communists.

Radio Free Europe might frankly discuss the present difficulties while at the same time exhorting the Iron Curtain slaves not to lose hope. The trans-Curtain people who long for liberty might at least be informed about where all of us stand. They should know about a long-range program as well as what can be done at this time.

Most important of all, Radio Free Europe should become a clear and shining beacon to those who are willing to fight for their liberties. This can only be achieved by throwing out the clowns and confusionists who want to fight communism with a Socialist "people's program." If Radio Free Europe cannot cleanse itself because it is from top to bottom infested with collectivists, internationalists, materialists and decadents, then it would be better to shut it down and replace it with an entirely new organization.

Perhaps this great reform cannot be undertaken as long as even in the United States the grass roots patriots, who unequivocally believe in God, the Constitution and freedom of enterprise, are successfully boycotted and ridiculed. Perhaps an effective liberation station can only be established when at last the collectivist corrupters of the United States are driven from their entrenched positions in America's public institutions, and her means of communication, and her government itself.

Kerner's "Czechoslovakia" (Cont'd.)

HISTORY OR PROPAGANDA?

P. A. HROBAK

According to Mr. Graham, there was no competition for the presidency after Masaryk resigned "in view of the outstanding character of Dr. Beneš" (p. 125). This is not exactly true, because the Hlinka Party opposed the election of Beneš, as did others, until Beneš promised reforms and the fulfillment of the Pittsburgh Pact, that is, that within a year of his election Slovakia would become autonomous. This disciple, after his election, reneged on the Pittsburgh Pact, just as his master did. This, of course, added to the "outstanding character" of Dr. Beneš.

•
"Freedom of the press, to the exclusion of the preliminary censorship so dreaded under the Austrian regime, was guaranteed. With unusual foresight, not matched by the political leaders of either Weimar Germany or Socialist Austria, the framers of the Czechoslovak Constitution made provision for legal restriction on the rights of the press, of assembly, and of association in time of war or in case of events taking place within the State seriously threatening the republican form of government, the Constitution, or public peace and order." — (p. 131).

Unusual foresight, indeed. "Public peace and order" must have been threatened thousands of times, judging from the "white spaces" in Slovak newspapers and books during the regimes of Masaryk and Beneš; entire editions of Slovak newspapers were confiscated many times. We have plenty of proof of that for Mr. Graham and all readers of Kerner's "Czechoslovakia." Guarantees of freedoms, liberties and rights on paper look nice, but mean nothing if they are not realized. The Masaryk-Beneš Czechs were in control of everything and could, therefore, interpret the Constitution as they pleased; under them political opposition was interpreted as "unlawful" and a threat to "public peace and order." According to Mr. Graham:

"Religious liberty was of primordial import . . . all religious confessions were treated as equal before the law . . . national, religious, and racial minorities were promised the same equality accorded to the Czechoslovaks in civil and political matters . . . a special language law, itself of a constitutional character, was issued Feb-

ruary 29, 1920, making the Czechoslovak language the official state language of the Republic, but making other languages, when used by a minority consisting of at least 20 percent of the inhabitants of any jurisdictional area, coordinately valid for virtually every legal purpose . . . the right of children to receive education in their mother tongue was guaranteed, but instruction in the Czech language could be made obligatory at any time. . . To the moment of partition it could truly be said by German, Magyar, Slovak Ruthene, or Czech, that the very air breathed the freedom of the human spirit, a freedom to which the republic was dedicated by its founders."

In short, as far as Mr. Graham was concerned, everything was just about perfect in the "democracy of Masaryk and Beneš." But the historical truth is that it was far from it. The Slovaks were not considered a minority, but they actually were worse off in many instances than any minority. The "Czechoslovak NATIONAL Church" — a strictly Czech enterprise — was established with the blessing and the support of the Masaryk-Beneš regimes. The "Czechoslovak" language did not and does not exist, but it became the official language of the Republic, without Mr. Graham knowing it. And worst of all, Mr. Graham presumes to speak for peoples about whom he knows little or nothing. If the nations of Czechoslovakia actually enjoyed freedom and liberties — "the freedom of the human spirit," as Graham calls it — in the democracy of Masaryk and Beneš, why did they not fire even a single shot in its defense?

Mr. Graham, like the other contributors to Kerner's "Czechoslovakia," eulogized Masaryk and Beneš and sweat-ed out a grandiloquent chapter based on the fiction of "Czechoslovak" unity. No matter what Graham's intentions or objectives were, there can be no justification for suppressing, denying, or falsifying established historical facts.

CHAPTER VIII — "Parties and Politics" — by Malbone W. Graham (vd. previous chapter).

The tendency so much in evidence in the previous chapter, contributed by the same author, prevails here. To Dr. Graham, "the political history of the Czechoslovak Republic reveals a pattern of continuity and stability unequalled by any other country in Europe." T. G. Masaryk and Beneš were masters of the situation. Foreign policy of the Re-

public was "in the expert hands of Dr. Eduard Beneš — for two decades, from 1915 to 1935"; but "even in the period of his presidency, Dr. Beneš continued to dominate morally the enterprise of diplomacy." The continuity in leadership, plus the "**continuity of principle**" — whatever that was, gave to the foreign policies of Czecho-Slovakia, and her domestic politics as well, "calmness, balance, and objectivity."

Beneš was no ordinary man, according to Graham. Only 34 years old in 1918 and without any practical political experience whatever, Beneš dominated the political scene in Czecho-Slovakia. "Dr. Beneš was given an opportunity, seldom vouchsafed by history, **to organize foreign policy realistically.**" Just how "realistically Beneš organized it became evident, first in 1938, and then in 1943. He made enemies of all neighboring countries, while in Czecho-Slovakia he failed miserably to gain the Slovaks. Beneš was a "révolté" — a socialist, also an atheist long before 1915. Beneš went to study to Prague before he was twelve years old. Edward B. Hitchcock, one of the most extravagant eulogists of Beneš, tells us ("**BENEŠ — The Man and The Statesman**" — Hamish Hamilton, London; 1940):

"Later, when he (Beneš) stayed for several years in Prague, he developed into a believer in brute materialism, anarchism, socialism. He was against religion. He was opposed to almost every established order in the world of that day.... And even the fundamental question — the existence of God — was for him a serious problem. He always countered with the statement that the existence of God was nothing but wishful thinking, that nobody could prove to him that there is a God."

Such a man, Graham would have us believe, gave the Czecho-Slovak domestic politics "calmness, balance, and objectivity." About 72 percent of the Czechs and 82 percent of the Slovaks were Catholics — and Beneš hated the Catholic Church. Mr. Graham apparently knew nothing of the background of Beneš, who also rated among Freemasons. In Paris, Prague, London and Berlin, the young man from Kožlany always felt at home in the company of socialists, wrote for their papers, but Mr. Graham, it seems, knows nothing about that; the same goes for the other contributors to Kerner's "Czechoslovakia." It seems that

they do not want students of history to know what made Beneš tick as he did. They are supposed to believe that the man just popped out of nowhere, met T. G. Masaryk, and became the greatest democrat and statesman in Europe.

•

"Along with the major current of social democracy in Czechoslovakia, there developed a subsidiary, reformist, **non-Marxian socialist party** with a definitely evolutionary program . . . it called itself the National Socialist Party. . . Accepting a program of evolutionary state socialism and **general collectivism**, without stressing the claims or the interests of industrial workers, the party was predestined to be disproportionately influential in the determination of policy, because a number of its members were highly placed in the government in the constitution-making period and because foreign affairs were in the hands of Dr. Beneš, who affiliated with the party in Parliament." — (p. 145).

Under Masaryk and Beneš, Czechoslovakia was made into a socialistic state. The Czech National Socialists (Czech Nazis) under Beneš promoted the godless, materialistic philosophy of Marx in Czechoslovakia from the very start of the Republic and, hence, the party could not have been a "non-Marxian socialist party," as Mr. Graham claims. The Czechs had no trouble in converting completely to communism in 1948, because Masaryk, Beneš and the socialists had prepared them for it. The Slovaks adamantly opposed communism, but could do nothing under the circumstances, because the Beneš political clique made policies.

•

"Under the organization after 1918, the principal party groups, taken from Right to Left, were approximately as follows: **The National Democrats... The Populists... The Agrarians... The Socialists... The Slovaks**" (pp. 140-146).

Mr. Graham has very little to say about the SLOVAKS, which means that he knew little or nothing about them. The Czechs did, however, run the entire political show in Czechoslovakia. In regard to the Slovaks, Mr. Graham tells us: "In the Revolutionary National Assembly the Slovaks initially formed a compact bloc, but shortly began to act with their Czech colleagues along definite party lines, following in general either a clerical, agrarian, or socialist orientation" (p. 146). Who those Slovaks were, however, Mr. Graham does not divulge. The fact is that

the overwhelming Catholic majority of the Slovak population had no representation in the Revolutionary National Assembly, the members of which were selected by Masaryk and Beneš. It is significant that all the Slovaks appointed were opponents of Slovak autonomy and proponents of "Czechoslovak" unity; and that the "Slovak bloc" included Czechs (Beneš, Alice Masaryk, Rotnágl, Kolísek, Záruba-Pfeffermann)! Misrepresentation, fraud and deceit were devices of the Beneš Czechs, used to befuddle the outside world.

The Slovaks were dealt with superficially also under the title of "The Populists," where Mr. Graham says:

"As in Weimar, Germany the Roman Catholic political forces in Czechoslovakia underwent a baptism of democracy and emerged as a **Czechoslovak People's Party** and a **Slovak People's Party**, respectively . . . the Populists demanded wide autonomy for the **local communities**. For twenty years the Slovak People's Party, led by Father Andrej Hlinka and for a time seconded by Professor Béla Tuka, was the principal foyer of Slovak **particularism and separatism**" (p. 142).

Strange things, indeed, happened in Weimar, Germany, and to the "Roman Catholic forces" in Czecho-Slovakia after a "baptism of democracy"! The Slovaks emerged as the **Slovak People's Party**, but the Czechs came out as the "**Czechoslovak People's Party**" and, apparently befuddled even Mr. Graham. And the country of the Slovaks, the land inhabited by them for at least the past 1500 years, became only a "**local community**"! Again Mr. Graham somehow forgot that Czecho-Slovakia was supposed to be a federation of Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia and Slovakia. And what was this "particularism and separatism" of Hlinka's party? Nothing else but a struggle for States' Rights for Slovakia within the framework of Czecho-Slovakia. Why didn't Mr. Graham say so? The answer is obvious.

"Both branches of the Populist movement," according to Graham, "subscribed to the philosophy of **Christian socialism as conceived in Austria**," that is, "endeavored to bring Christian, i.e., Catholic ideas into effect in legislation and to fight for the preservation of the influence of the Catholic Church in the schools and in public life," says Graham quoting the words of one of the apologists of the

movement. And this, Graham wants us to believe, gave the Populist parties an **"anti-socialist character."** A queer deduction, indeed! The question crops up: what is the essential difference between Christian and non-Christian socialism — and which would better serve the interests of a country whose population is for the most part Catholic?

•

"By the law of April 16, 1919, there was created the Czechoslovak Land Office...with a president appointed by Masaryk and an administrative board appointed by the Revolutionary National Assembly. To this body were given plenary powers for the expropriation and reallocation of land... In this way the **CZECHOSLOVAK REPUBLIC** undid the historic wrongs by which after 1620 the greater part of the **CZECH** nobility were deprived of their lands and German servitors of the Habsburgs were colonized upon them." — (p. 148).

The Land Reform benefitted the Czechs especially — the politicians in Prague, their families and friends — who never had to worry about money afterward. Graham tells us that the estates of the crown and the nobility were expropriated "outright and without compensation, whereas in other cases the State offered "appropriate compensation." Historic "wrongs" were undone by committing more "wrongs"! What lands did the **CZECH** nobility lose in **Slovakia** after 1620? Why does Mr. Graham identify the "**Czechoslovak Republic**" with the **Czech** nobility? Obviously because to him the Republic meant **CZECHS**. He omits the fact that German nobility lost its lands also. Mr. Graham would have us believe that 1620 (White Mountain) was a nationalistic affair, but we know that it was a purely religious and dynastic affair. After the **Bohemian** (not Czech) magnates were defeated, the emperor wrought vengeance upon his enemies — both Czech and German — and made Bohemia a hereditary crownland.

•

Opposite page 152 we find a nice picture of Beneš, under which we read:

"EDUARD BENEŠ—President of the Czechoslovak Republic, 1935-1938, 1940 —" I do not know whether it was placed there by Mr. Kerner or Mr. Graham; most likely it was put there by Mr. Kerner. Be that as it may, it is

significant that the year 1939 did not figure. The historical fact, however, is that President Beneš voluntarily resigned the presidency of Czecho-Slovakia in 1938, cowardly fled the country, and the Czecho-Slovak Parliament elected Hácha as provided by the Constitution. Why should Kerner, Graham, or any one else for that matter, want us to believe that Beneš was still president from "1940—"? The latter, I believe, in order to conform to fact, should read: 1940—1948: **Moscow Puppet.**

•

In Graham's chapter on "Parties and politics," the Czechs figure most prominently, while the Slovaks are more ignored than the Germans. Beneš, Kramář, Tusar, Rašín, Masaryk, Černý, Švehla, Udržal, Gajda, Malypetr, Krofta, — ALL CZECHS — shone brightly on the political scene, while Slovak Hlinka is mentioned just casually and Slovak Hodža comes on the stage only late in 1935. At least one thing should be very clear: whatever happened to the Republic was the responsibility of the Masaryk-Beneš Czechs. Czecho-Slovakia was ruled by coalition governments, but the radical left-wingers, followers of the materialistic, socialistic philosophy of Marx, always predominated. Under the "democratic" system of Masaryk and Beneš, the Slovaks were powerless and had practically no influence on policy, foreign or domestic. Neither did the Germans and the Magyars of the Republic.

When the "ultraconservative elements" in Malypetr's coalition seceded, he found it necessary, according to Mr. Graham, "to combat legislatively **the abuses of the press** to which the extremist organs of indigenous Czech fascism and the imported German variety lent themselves." Graham continues (pp. 162-163):

"Without surrendering fundamental liberties, it was made difficult for factions hostile to the **democratic order** to pursue their activities in the press with impunity. Although applicable to all factions, including Communists, the fascist groups and the German National Socialists were the principal ones to feel the brunt of the new legislation."

But the truth is that the Slovaks, who continued to demand "states' rights" (autonomy) within the framework of Czecho-Slovakia and never were "hostile to the demo-

cratic order," felt the brunt of the new legislation even more than the communists, fascists and German National Socialists of Czecho-Slovakia. Mr. Graham, however, prefers to ignore this historical fact, as he also does the actual Czech-Slovak problem, the relations between the Czechs and Slovaks, which became so utterly deteriorated under the Masaryk and Beneš regimes. Again the tendency is only too obvious.

The Czecho-Slovak political pot, fired by the stupid and highly inflammable policies of the Beneš Czechs, was coming to a boil. "Henlein's group openly began to espouse the leadership principle, to subscribe to the totalitarian philosophy of German national socialism" (p. 165) — something the Czechs did not suspect, Graham would have us believe, saying:

"This orientation caused genuine apprehension on the part of the Czechs, and the accession of Hodža to power was viewed as an open indication to the world of Czech and Slovak solidarity, although to the end of the Republic the Slovak Populists under Hlinka retained their diffidence and refused to participate in the coalition, demanding too high a price by way of autonomy for Slovakia for even Hodža, himself a Slovak, to pay."

One of the greatest concerns of the Beneš Czechs was to have the world believe that all Czechs and all Slovaks were solidly behind them. The world wanted to be deceived, hence deceived it was. Graham would want it to labor under that deception indefinitely, it seems. If it was in Hodža's power, he would have gladly payed the price of autonomy to the Slovaks; the Beneš Czechs remained stubbornly against it to the very last, though they were willing to grant Henlein almost anything and everything in 1938 to save their reeling "Czechoslovak democracy." Hodža, who was made the scapegoat of the events which preceded the total collapse of the Republic and who despite his better judgment stuck with the Beneš Czechs to the bitter end, was later dumped by them.

(More coming)

The BEST available ENGLISH-SLOVAK DICTIONARY? Yes, we have it. Get your copy of HROBAK'S ENGLISH-SLOVAK DICTIONARY today! Only \$4.00 per copy.

Officers of the Slovak League of America

(Organized 1907 in Cleveland, Ohio)

Honorary President
Dr. Peter P. Hletko
1943 W. 48th Street
Chicago 9, Illinois

President
Philip A. Hrobak
P. O. Box 150, Middletown, Pa.

Vice-President
Jacob Kocis
1547 -- 167th Street
Hammond, Ind.

Vice-President
Julia Krajcovic
1648 W. 18th St., Chicago 8, Ill.

Recording Secretary
Francis Hrusovsky
2900 East Boulevard
Cleveland 4, Ohio

Secretary-Treasurer
Milan V. Blazek
4922 S. Leclair Avenue
Chicago 38, Ill.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Paul P. Jamriska
810 Montooth Street
Pittsburgh 10, Pa.

Joseph Prusa
205 Madison St., Passaic, N. J.

Frances L. Mizenko
3756 Lee Road
Cleveland 28, Ohio

Stephen J. Tkach
173 N. Main Street
Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

Andrew J. Hamrock
61 Woodland Avenue
Campbell, Ohio

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Michael J. Vargovich
National President
First Catholic Slovak Union

Helen Kocan
National President
First Catholic Slovak
Ladies Union

Frank Bobus
National President
Slovak Catholic Sokol

Stephen J. Tkach
National President
Penna. Slovak Union

Gabriela E. Vavrek
National President
Ladies Pennsylvania
Slovak Union

John Rozboril
National President
Slovak Catholic Cadet Union

SLOVAK NEWSPAPERS

(Affiliated with the Slovak League of America)

JEDNOTA
Middletown, Pa.

SLOVENSKÁ OBRANA
Scranton, Pa.

ŽENSKÁ JEDNOTA
Cleveland, Ohio

BRATSTVO
Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

SLOVENSKÉ NOVINY
Cleveland, Ohio

ZORNIČKA
Chicago, Ill.

KATOLÍCKY SOKOL
Passaic, N. J.

SVORNOST
Whitaker, Pa.

OSADNÉ HLASY
Chicago, Ill.

SLOVÁK V AMERIKE
Whiting, Ind.



SLOVAKIA: the ruins of the STARÁ ĽUBOVŇA above
the Poprad Valley.

GANSER LIBRARY
MILLERSVILLE STATE COLLEGE
MILLERSVILLE, PA. 17551